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# **Introduction**

In RAN1#102e and 103e meeting, progress on HARQ related issues have been achieved. In this meeting, companies’ views to refine the details and on other remaining issues are summarized with corresponding observations/proposals on following aspects with detailed proposals from each company listed in Appendix.

* Enhanced HARQ process ID indication
* HARQ codebook enhancements
* PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling restriction
* Restriction on HARQ feedback disabling
* Performance enhancements

# **Enhanced HARQ process ID indication**

In RAN1#103e, following agreement has been achieved:

Agreement:

* Enhanced HARQ process ID indication is supported for DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1 by at least one of following:
	+ Option 1: Slot index as the MSB
	+ Option 1-a:Slot index as the LSB
	+ Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
	+ Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits
* FFS: DCI 0-0/1-0
* Note: 32 is taken as maximal supported HARQ processes number for both UL and DL

Then, in this meeting, ***views on following options from 25 companies are summarized as:***

* Option 1: Slot index as the MSB is supported by [OPPO, Huawei, Intel, Lenovo, Panasonic(2nd priority), Xiaomi, Qualcomm]
* Option 1-a: Slot index as the LSB is supported by [CATT, ZTE, Intel, Panasonic (2nd priority), Xiaomi].
* Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field is supported by [Huawei, CATT, ZTE, MTK, Spreadtrum, China Telecom, ETRI, Apple]. More specifically, w.r.t the applicability, at least following are highlighted:
	+ Applicable for DCI format:
		- DCI 0-0/1-0 [vivo, ZTE, Apple]
		- DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-2/1-2 [ZTE]
* Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits is supported by [CAICT, vivo, MTK, LG, Spreadtrum, China Telecom, Ericsson, APT, InterDigital, Panasonic(first priority), CMCC, Samsung, Nokia, Apple]. More specifically, w.r.t the applicability, at least following are highlighted:
	+ Applicable for DCI format:
		- DCI 0-2/1-2 [Ericsson]
		- DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-2/1-2 [vivo, CAICT, LG, APT, Panasonic, CMCC, Nokia, Apple]
		- DCI 0-0/1-0 [CAICT, CMCC]
	+ Not applicable for DCI format:
		- DCI 0-0/1-0 [Ericsson, Panasonic]

Moreover, w.r.t DCI 0-0/1-0, [Nokia, Ericsson] highlight that one additional bit (as MSB) can be added for HARQ ID indication (only applicable for NTN). As default, 16 HARQ process number is assumed for DCI 0-0 and 8 is assumed for DCI 1-0 [CATT]. In addition, [Sony, Nokia, Intel, MTK] prefer to support only one option. [Ericsson] also highlights that the enhanced HARQ indication is used once the larger HARQ process number is configured via RRC signalling for both DL and UL.

According to the above summary, the following proposals are listed as majority views:

**[Initial Proposal 1]:**

Enhancement on the HARQ process indication is supported as:

* For DCI 0-2/1-2:
	+ Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits
* For DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-0/1-0, at least one of following is supported:
	+ Option 1: Slot index as the MSB
	+ Option 1-a:Slot index as the LSB
	+ Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
	+ Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits

Please provide your views below including preference for each DCI format and option.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Panasonic | We are not supportive for proposal 1 as it is. We are ok with DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0\_1/1\_2. For DCI 0\_0/1\_0, it would not be desired to extend considering the fallback usage of DCI 0\_0/1\_0. No enhancement for DCI 0\_0/1\_0 should be listed as an option.  |
| OPPO | Fallback DCIWe think that it is risky to re-interpretation DCI field for fallback DCI 0-0/1-0 based on UE-specific RRC configuration. Any ambiguity will cause serious problem and this is not NR R15 design principle. Non-FB DCIIt is beneficial to have a unified design to minimize the specification load.  |
| LG | For DCI format 0-1, 0-2/1-1, 1-2, option 3 is preferred. However, For DCI 0-0/1-0, no enhancement is preferred due to backward compatibility issue. |
| vivo | For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support the proposal.For DCI 0-1/1-1, we support the Option 3. If the number of HARQ processes be used for uplink or downlink is configured to be 32 by the high layer parameter, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits, otherwise 4 bits.For the DCI 0-0/1-0, if necessary to schedule the 32 HARQ processes, we support Option 2. We also accept to restrict the application of 32 HARQ processes on DCI 0-0/1-0. |
| CMCC | For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support the proposal.For DCI 0-1/1-1, we support the Option 3.For DCI 0-0/1-0, we support the Option 3 too. Furthermore, we are OK to restrict such enhancement only applicable for NTN. |
| ZTE | Supportive for the proposal.W.r.t the DCI 0-0/1-0, in existing specification, such DCI can be still reused after the initial access for normal PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with lower DCI size. The benefits for such scheduling is clear to ensure the detection of control information with less overhead. Meanwhile, for NTN scenarios, the transmission is mainly in LoS case with RANK =1 (RANK = 2 is not available due to the mismatch between circular polarization and linear.), So, single TB scheduling is preferred in this case and continuous usage of fallback DCI is still reasonable.W.r.t the potential impact, either Option 2 can be taken as the 1st priority due ot the less impact on the DCI design.  |
| Intel | In our view 32 HARQ processes should be not supported for DCI 0-0/1-0 for backward compatibility with Rel. 15. For DCI 0-1/1-1, our preference is option 1 or 1-a. We can accept option 3 as a compromise.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the first bullet. We are also fine with reusing one bit from another field for DCI 0\_2/1\_2. For DCI 0-0/1-0, we support Option 2. * Option 3 should not be used for DCI 0-0/1-0 due to the static DCI size.
* Option 1/ 1-a has scheduling restrictions. For example, half of the HARQ processes are restricted to be scheduled at a slot in Option 1/1-a. Also, the scheduling restriction may not be aligned with SPS configuration, where the HARQ process number is already associated with slot index.
* Not supporting 32 HARQ processes in case of DCI 0-0/1-0 will actually increase UE’s DCI decoding efforts, since UE has to monitor both fallback DCI and non fallback DCI if it uses 32 HARQ processes.
 |
| Huawei | We continue to be of the opinion that the indication mechanisms should not diverge between the fallback and non-fallback DCIs. It is not a good design to have the UE interpret the HARQ process ID differently depending on what kind of DCI is used for scheduling resources for it.Moreover, since the maximum supported HARQ process number depends on UE’s capability, the default process may still not larger than 16, it’s not expedient to extend the existing HARQ process number ID field when other options with less specification impact can be applied to support the maximum HARQ process ID of 32.For option 1 and 1-a, Option 1 is preferred as it is more suitable to uniform the meaning of HARQ ID indication in the existing DCI field when UEs with different supportable HARQ process number are considered. For example, with slot index as the MSB, a UE with maximal 16 HARQ process will be indicated by the existing HARQ ID field directly. However, with option 1-a, the last bit is indicated by slot index and the remained bits is indicated by the existing HARQ ID field even with only 16 HARQ process which introduce more impact to on specification.Option 2 can be applied if DCI has redundant field when HARQ process is disabled. The benefits of Option 2 is that it can support flexible scheduling while has minimum impact on specification. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal for DCI 0-2/1-2.DCI 0-1/1-1 should be separated from DCI 0-0/1-0 in the proposal since fallback DCI 0-1/1-1 do not need to support the feature as elaborated below.Non-fallback DCI 0-1/1-1 is intended to support adding new features. Extending the HARQ process ID to up to 5 bits should be the chosen solution since it is in line with common practice for NR design and no drawbacks have been shown for this solution. On the contrary, slot index based solutions adds new restrictions to scheduling which could have significant implementation impact and should therefore be avoided.Fall-back DCI 0-0/1-0 is used for basic scheduling and need not support 32 HARQ processes which is needed only for high throughput use cases. In general, RRC configurable features should not impact fallback DCI. Note: The statement by the FL above Initial Proposal 1, “… w.r.t DCI 0-0/1-0, [Nokia, Ericsson] highlight that one additional bit (as MSB) can be added for HARQ ID indication (only applicable for NTN).” does not reflect Ericsson’s view. In our contribution, we make the following observation: “Observation 1: It is not necessary to schedule 32 HARQ processes using fallback DCI 0\_0/1\_0.” We kindly ask the FL to remove Ericsson from the bracket in the text above. |
| MediaTek | At least, re-interpretation DCI field for fallback DCI 0-0/1-0 should be avoided during initial access to allow support of UE capability for 32 HARQ processes. We are generally not supportive of re-interpretation DCI field for fallback DCI 0-0/1-0 based on UE-specific RRC configuration.  |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. In addition, a unified solution is preferred. |
| Spreadtrum | For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support the proposal.For DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-0/1-0, we support the Option 3. |
| Sony | We prefer a unified solution for different DCI formats, we prefer option 1/1-a among the three options. |
| Qualcomm | Uniform interpretation of HARQ process IDs between fallback and regular DCI is preferred.For process ID indication, we prefer option 1 and 1-a given its less impact on spec. The scheduling limitation of option1/1a is minimum given that network has the flexibility to configure the HARQ processes. |
| CATT | If NTN UE can have different DCI size compared to other UE, then we prefer one unified solution to support 5 bits HARQ indication for all DCI formats. |
| Xiaomi | We also support to have unified solution for fallback and non-fallback DCI. Given that size of fallback DCI is not configurable, we support option 1 or 1a. |
| InterDigital | Similar view with vivo except for DCI 0-0/1-0.DCI 0-2/1-2: support proposalDCI 0-1/1-1: Option-3DCI 0-0/1-0: no support of 32 HARQ processes  |
| ChinaTelecom | For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support the proposal.For DCI 0-1/1-1, we support the Option 2.For DCI 0-0/1-0, we support the Option 2 or no enhancement. |
| Lenovo&MotoM | We share the similar view as Intel, for DCI format 0-0/1-0, 32 HARQ process is not supported for backward compatibility with Rel.15.For DCI 0-1/1-1, our first preference is option 1 or 1-a, and option 3 is our second preference. |
| Samsung | Option 3 in all cases |
| ETRI | For DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-0/1-0, we support Option 2 considering the impact on specification and scheduling restrictions. For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support the proposal and we also fine with Option 2. |
| CAICT | DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-2/1-2: option3.DCI 0-0/1-0: Option 3 or no enhancement. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | For DCI 0-2/1-2, support the initial proposal.For DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-0/1-0, we would recommend that a single option is supported. After all, any of the options proposed here are targeting the same purpose (indicating the HARQ process). Options 1 and 1-a are potentially suffering from lack of flexibility for indicating the HARQ process ID, as they are utilizing implicit indication based on information that may not always be available. Using the slot index will force the gNB to configure a PDCCH monitoring periodicity of “1”, which in turn will also force the UE to be constantly monitor for scheduling grants, thereby removing possibilities for UE power saving (our understanding is that UE power saving is a priority as well). Option 2 would potentially reduce the scheduling and link adaptation flexibility since the reused bit will be removing functionality from existing functionality. Option 3 would be relatively simply to implement, as there are currently no legacy NTN devices, and such devices would anyway need to implement new functionality to support NR over NTN. With option 3 we would have a solution that is uniform across the DCI formats. |
| APT | Support **[Initial Proposal 1]**For DCI 0-1/1-1, we propose to consider that. **Option 4**: not support DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-0/1-0 to indicate a HARQ number >16. NW only uses non-fallback DCIs to indicate a HARQ number > 16. |

# **HARQ codebook enhancements**

In RAN1#103e, following agreement has been achieved:

Agreement:

HARQ codebook enhancement is supported as:

* For Type-2 HARQ codebook:
	+ Option-1: Reduce codebook size with:
		- HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes
			* FFS: the details of C-DAI and T-DAI counting for DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enable/disabled HARQ processes
		- FFS: at least DCI for SPS release/SPS PDSCH
	+ Option-2: No enhancement
	+ Other options are not precluded.
* For Type-1 HARQ codebook, further discuss is needed with down selection among following options:
	+ Option-1: No enhancement;
	+ Option-2: Report NACK on disabled process
	+ Option-3: Reduce codebook size with criteria
* FFS: Enhancements for Type-3 HARQ codebook

Then, in this meeting, ***further views from 24 companies are summarized as:***

1. W.r.t the Type-1 Codebook (Semi-static codebook):
	* Option-1: ZTE, CATT, Intel, Lenovo, Panasonic, CMCC, Xiaomi, Nokia
	* Option-2: Ericsson, MTK
	* Option-3: Huawei, Sony, InterDigital, Samsung
2. W.r.t the Type-2 Codebook (Dynamic codebook):
	* Option 1: OPPO, Huawei, ZTE, CAICT, CATT, vivo, Intel, Lenovo, Spreadtrum, APT, InterDigital, Ericsson, Xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Apple, Qaulcomm

W.r.t the C-DAI and T-DAI counting, following details are listed:

* Alt-1: C-DAI and T-DAI count only PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes [LG]
	+ In the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given their true values (i.e., the count of feedback-enabled processes)
	+ In the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given their true values (i.e.,the count of feedback-enabled processes), despite they are not incremented.
* Alt-2: C-DAI and T-DAI count only PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes [Ericsson, Apple]
	+ In the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given their true values (i.e.,the count of feedback-enabled processes)
	+ In the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given a reserved value that can be ignored by the UE
* Alt-3: HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of enabled PDSCH [OPPO]
	+ C-DAI/T-DAI value in DCI scheduling enabled PDSCH is counted for enabled PDSCH
	+ C-DAI/T-DAI value in DCI scheduling disabled PDSCH is counted for disabled PDSCH
* Alt 4: HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of enabled PDSCH
	+ New parameter to count DAI for DCI carrying HARQ process with enabled feedback [ZTE]
* Alt 5: HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of enabled PDSCH
	+ C-DAI and T-DAI count both PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes and PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes [Xiaomi]
	+ Option 2: Panasonic, Nokia
1. W.r.t Type-3 Codebook:
	1. Supportive to enhancement: Huawei, ZTE, vivo, LG, Ericsson
		1. Solution 1: No feedback for HARQ process with disabled feedback [Huawei, ZTE, vivo, LG, Ericsson]
	2. Negative to enhancement: OPPO, CATT, Lenovo, Spreadtrum, Sony, Nokia

According to the above summary, the following proposals are listed as majority views:

**[Initial Proposal 2]:**

For the following HARQ codebook in NTN:

* Type-1 HARQ codebook: No enhancement is considered;
* Type-2 HARQ codebook: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes
* Type-3 HARQ codebook:
	+ Alt-1: No enhancement
	+ Alt-2: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Panasonic  | Support proposal 2. Although exact meaning of “no enhancement” is not described, our understanding from companies’ contributions is that no enhancement means ACK/NACK information for HARQ-feedback disabled process is included in the HARQ-ACK codebook.  |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposals for type 1 and type 2. For type 3, we question its benefit compared with type 1 and type 2. We have the followings concerns:1. In the current specification, type 3 cannot be configured alone but jointly configured with type 1 or type 2, which means that the UE cannot be configured to only report type 3.
2. Type 3 was introduced in NRU WI in order to benefit from the HARQ-ACK retransmission due to LBT failure. However, this benefit does not exist in NTN because the initial HARQ-ACK transmission can always be realized. Moreover, once the initial HARQ-ACK transmission is conducted, type 3 codebook only contains invalid NACK, which does not provide any information to the network.
3. Type 3 has larger codebook overhead, type 2 codebook is much more efficient than type 3.

With the above reasons, we don’t support type 3 codebook in NTN.  |
| LG | We are generally ok with the FL’s proposal. One clarification question is what is the meaning of “No enhancement in Type-1 HARQ codebook”? * UE feedback actual ACK/NACK information even in case of HARQ feedback-disabled, and gNB still can configure actual “PRI/K1” value. Is it correct understanding? Then, it seems contradicting the meaning of HARQ feedback disabling.
 |
| vivo | For Type-1 HARQ codebook, the straightforward way is to reuse the semi-static HARQ-ACK determination scheme, i.e. no enhancement. But a special case should be considered, where only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted within the  occasion. In this case, HARQ-ACK feedback can be omitted. So,* **For Type-1 HARQ codebook:**
	+ **If both enabled HARQ processes or SPS release and disabled HARQ processes are transmitted in the**  **occasions, no enhancement.**
	+ **If only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted in the** **occasions, omit the HARQ-ACK report.**

For type-2 HARQ codebook, support the proposal. W.r.t the C-DAI and T-DAI counting, Alt-1 is preferred.For type-3 HARQ codebook, support Alt-2 if considering type-3 HARQ codebook in NTN is necessary. |
| CMCC | For Type-1 HARQ codebook, in general, we are fine to this proposal. Nevertheless, we are open to further discuss potential enhancement to omit the HARQ-ACK report if only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted, as suggested by vivo.For type-2 HARQ codebook, support the proposal. W.r.t the C-DAI and T-DAI counting, Alt-2 is preferred. Furthermore, the C-DAI and T-DAI field in the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes may be disabled or reinterpreted.For type-3 HARQ codebook, we are open to both alts, but the motivation for potential enhancement needs more clarification. |
| ZTE | Supportive for the proposal.As clarification for the no enhancement, if no enhancement is introduced for the disabled HARQ process, one way is that the UE can still follow the same legacy behaviour to generate the ACK-NACK. From gNB perspective, the scheduling can be either done with or without consideration of potential information from UE.  |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| Thales | Type 1 HARQ codebook : No enhancement is needed. Defining the value to be reported for disabled processes may be beneficial to avoid non-deterministic behaviours.Type-2 HARQ codebook: Support moderator proposalType 3 HARQ codebook: Support Alt-2 |
| Apple | For type-1 HARQ codebook, we are fine with the proposal. We think HARQ-ACK codebook size should not be reduced for HARQ processes with disabled HARQ feedback. This is to avoid ambiguity in DTX scenario. If a UE fails decoding a DCI, it does not know whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled for the corresponding HARQ process. Hence, the reduction on HARQ-ACK codebook size could lead to mis-align between UE and gNB. For Type-2 HARQ codebook, we are fine with the proposal. However, it does not conclude the signaling of C-DAI and T-DAI. We think further down-selection of signaling is beneficial. Overall, we think C-DAI for HARQ processes with disabled feedback is given a reserved value, which can be ignored by the UE. T-DAI for HARQ processes with disabled feedback is a true value. This alternative may also be listed. We are open to Type-3 HARQ codebook as it is not restricted to unlicensed band. Besides the proposal, we think the HARQ codebook construction for SPS PDSCH should be studied. Note that a SPS configuration may contain multiple HARQ processes. Do we need to consider the case where the HARQ processes in a SPS configuration are configured with different HARQ feedback settings?  |
| Huawei | We prefer Option3 of Type-1 HARQ codebook in the agreement. When a large number of HARQ processes are disabled, e. g. only one HARQ process is enabled, reducing the codebook size will be beneficial to reduce the resources for UL and also reduce the power consumption of UE.Agree with the enhancement of Type-2 HARQ codebook.We prefer Alt-2 of Type-3 HARQ codebook. In NTN, HARQ process is enabled/disabled per UE and per process and the information will be indicated to UE. The benefit of enhancing the Type-3 HARQ codebook with Alt-2 is clear, i. s. reducing the resources for UL while with no extra signalling. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal for Type-2 HARQ codebook and Alt-2 for Type-3 HARQ codebook. For Type-3, RAN1 has agreed that it is generally applicable (i.e., also to licenced spectrum) and therefore it should be applicable also for NTN.For Type-1 HARQ codebook, if UE would be required to report ACK/NAK depending on the decoding results for a HARQ feedback disabled process, it misses the purpose of disabling HARQ feedback, which is the motivation behind Option 3 of reducing the codebook size. We believe Option 2 (insert NAK) is a reasonable compromise between Option 1 (do nothing) and Option 3 (reduce the codebook size). |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal for type 1 and type 2.  |
| Sony | We generally support the Type-2 HARQ codebook part in Initial Proposal 2. But the details such as DAI, HARQ-ACK bit for special DCIs need more discussion.For Type-1 HARQ codebook, we think HARQ codebook size reduction is necessary and enhancements needed.Our view is not to support Type-3 HARQ codebook in NTN. |
| Qualcomm | For Type-1 HARQ codebook, we believe enhancement is needed: either insert NACK or reducing the codebook size.We support the proposal for Type-2 HAR codebook if it means that the DAI counters only count the PDSCHs with feedback enabled.For Type-3, we support Alt 2. |
| CATT | For Type-1 and Type-2 HARQ codebook, We support FL proposal.For Type-3 HARQ codebook, we don’t think it should be discussed in NTN.  |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| ChinaTelecom | For type 1 HARQ codebook: Support no enhancement.For type-2 HARQ codebook: Support moderator proposalFor type 3 HARQ codebook: Prefer Alt-2 |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Support the proposal 2.For Type I HARQ process codebook, we need the clarification that no enhancement is ACK/NACK for HARQ-feedback disabled process is also included in the HARQ-ACK codebook.For Type-2 HARQ process codebook, we prefer option 1For Type-3 HARQ process codebook, it is introduced in NRU to facilitate the HARQ-ACK retransmission due to LBT failure, so it doesn’t need to support Type-3 HARQ codebook in NTN. |
| Samsung | Type-1 should report NACK for disabled HARQ processes, at least when the payload is less than 12 bits, in order to reduce required transmission power for achieving the target BLER and to improve coverage.Support the proposal for Type-2.No further discussion for Type-3 – Alt-1. Type-3 is not useful for licensed spectrum operation where it is always worse than Type-2 (whether HARQ processes are enabled or disabled). Else, enhancements to enhanced Type-2 (also always better than Type-3) should also be included. |
| CAICT | For Type-1 HARQ Codebook, support the initial proposal.For Type-2 HARQ codebook, support the initial proposal. For the feedback disabled HARQ processes, C-DAI, T-DAI and other HARQ-ACK feedback related bit fields could be removed from the corresponding DCI or be used as other indication.For Type-3 HARQ codebook, Alt-2 could be considered. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support the proposal for Type-1 HARQ codebook.For the Type-2 HARQ codebook, it seems that there is a majority on performing “optimization” of the codebook, but it also seems that there is a lot of fragmentation in the proposed solutions to reach the optimization. Compared to existing default (no optimization), it would be nice if a consolidated proposal is provided such that it is possible to evaluate possible error scenarios. Only at this point it should be possible to evaluate if the optimization makes sense over the no enhancement option.For Type-3 HARQ codebook, we would have a preference for Alt-1, but could potentially accept Alt-2. It is worth noting that a few companies proposed to not support Type-3 HARQ codebook at all for NR over NTN (OPPO, Sony, CATT). This solution could also be considered. |
| APT | Partially support. Support Type-2 and Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebooks in [Initial Proposal 2]. However, we have concern on the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.For Type-1, we may need a LS to RAN2 to make sure UE still generates HARQ-ACK information in the MAC layer when HARQ-ACK is disabled. Otherwise, there would be no HARQ-ACK for Layer 1 to perform “no enhancement”. Using NACK is easier and RAN1 can make this decision. |

# **PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling restriction**

In RAN1#103e, following agreement has been achieved:

Agreement:

For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until [X] after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.

* FFS: value of X and units in which it is defined.
* FFS: Whether TB of the two PDSCHs needs to be different

Then, in this meeting, ***further views from 11 companies are summarized for PDSCH as:***

1. FFS: value of X and units in which it is defined.
	1. X is determined from N1 processing time [OPPO]
	2. X is T\_proc,1 for PDSCH [ZTE, vivo, APT, Apple]
	3. X is not include HARQ-ACK preparation time [CATT]
	4. X is one slot [Nokia]
	5. X=max (Tproc,1, Tslot\*k) where k is the minimum of minimum of  *dl-DataToUL-ACK* if configured and 0 otherwise. [Qualcomm]
2. FFS: Whether TB of the two PDSCHs needs to be different
	1. Different: OPPO, CATT
	2. No restriction: ZTE, vivo, Ericsson, Nokia

In addition, following two definition is proposed by [Ericsson] to clarify the definition of X:

* Definition 1: X is defined from the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback to the start of the DCI scheduling another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH for the given HARQ process.
* Definition 2: X is defined from the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback to the start of another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH for the given HARQ process.

The 1st definition is preferred by [Ericsson] to update the previous agreement and the value of X should be less than $T\_{proc,1}$ when the PDSCH is scheduled on a HARQ process with feedback disabled.

From moderator perspective, in existing specification, w.r.t the PDSCH scheduling, followings are defined in 38.214:

***PDSCH***

*For any HARQ process ID(s) in a given scheduled cell, the UE is not expected to receive a PDSCH that overlaps in time with another PDSCH. The UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of HARQ-ACK for that HARQ process, where the timing is given by Clause 9.2.3 of 38.213*

*If the first uplink symbol of the PUCCH which carries the HARQ-ACK information, as defined by the assigned HARQ-ACK timing K1 and the PUCCH resource to be used and including the effect of the timing advance, starts no earlier than at symbol L1, where L1 is defined as the next uplink symbol with its CP starting after* $T\_{proc,1}$ *,… , after the end of the last symbol of the PDSCH carrying the TB being acknowledged, then the UE shall provide a valid HARQ-ACK message.*

The first paragraph highlights the limitation on consecutive scheduling of PDSCH with same HARQ process, and the 2nd one refers to the minimum required time for PDSCH process including HARQ-ACK information preparation. More specifically:

* For the PDSCH scheduling:

In TN case, from the UE side, same HARQ process can be reused only after the transmission of HARQ-ACK with corresponding timing, which means that at gNB side, scheduling over one HARQ process is only available once the HARQ-ACK information of previous scheduling for given HARQ process is received.

But in NTN case, the intention of disabling of HARQ feedback is to resolve the impact of larger RTT and allow the scheduling with same HARQ process from gNB side without reception of HARQ-ACK feedback. So, the only issue is to avoid the overlapped PDSCHs reception with same HARQ process considering the UE’s capability of PDSCH processing.

* For the process timing:

In TN case, from the UE side, the minimum required time for PDSCH processing and HARQ-ACK preparation is defined as $T\_{proc,1}$. It should be noticed that the previous value is not coupled with the K1 (*HARQ-ACK timing K1* , i.e., *dl-DataToUL-ACK)* and the latter one is defined for timing of HARQ-ACK feedback to handling the potential impact of TA and PUCCH preparation.

However, in NTN case with disabled feedback, the scheduling restriction for PDSCH should only target for the PDSCH process without any consideration for HARQ-ACK feedback. Then, the X = $T\_{proc,1}$ is enough as the gap between two PDSCH with same HARQ process. W.r.t the further reduction of this value, e.g., to exclude the HARQ-ACK generation time, from moderator perspective, it’s not necessary to further define the UE capability and reuse the current spec is preferred to minimize the impacts on UE implementation.

Then, w.r.t the 2nd FFS on Whether TB of the two PDSCHs needs to be different, from moderator perspective, there is no need to introduce additional restriction on scheduling since supportive on the same TB is beneficial in same case as blind retransmission.

Based on the above analysis, following proposal is provided according to majority view:

**[Initial Proposal 3]:**

For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until $T\_{proc,1}$ after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.

* Note: The TB of the two PDSCHs can be either same or different

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 3.  |
| OPPO | From our understanding, for PDSCH decoding without HARQ-ACK feedback, the time gap N1 is sufficient, because N1 already refers to the PDSCH processing time. There is no additional UE processing burden. But when it comes to FL’s proposal to further relax this time to Tproc,1, as a UE vendor, we are fine with this proposal.  |
| LG | Ok with proposal. Another issue can be scheduling restriction with different HARQ process. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal.  |
| ZTE | Supportive |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| Thales | Support |
| Apple | We agree with the propose in the main bullet. For the “note” part, we are still not sure if the restriction applies to the same TB of the two PDSCHs. If majority of companies are fine with it, we could accept it.  |
| Huawei | We agree with proposal 3. |
| Ericsson | X should be reduced compared to $T\_{proc,1}$ since, unlike the case of feedback-enabled HARQ processes, no time is needed to prepare HARQ-ACK. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 3 |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| Sony | Support Initial Proposal 3. |
| Qualcomm | Support to include K1, i.e., X=max (Tproc,1, Tslot\*k), to ensure same processing timeline between two type of HARQ processes. Although Tproc,1 is the required minimal processing time, UE can always make use of the less strict processing time when configured in their implementation, such as k1. |
| CATT | Based on Rel-15 specification, we think N1 is sufficient because HARQ-ACK preparation time is not needed. If the majority think Tproc,1 is accepted, it is ok for us. For the note, one concern is that if we allow same TB is transmitted in the next slots, UE may not flush buffer until NDI is toggled. In extreme case, UE will wait for long time to receive next PDSCH with same HARQ ID under the HARQ-ACK disabled case, it is not desired for UE buffer flushing. So we think the note should be discussed further or removed.  |
| ChinaTelecom | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. This is a corner case under the NW control and a marginal reduction in latency while defining new UE behaviour is not justified.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with the FL proposal. |
| APT | Support [Initial Proposal 3] |

Moreover, according to the recommendation in the FL summary is last meeting, ***further views from 5 companies w.r.t the PUSCH scheduling is summarized***:

[Qualcomm, OPPO, vivo] propose to define a minimum gap between two PUSCHs of a HARQ process, for example, T\_proc,2 is defined in [OPPO]. However, as proposed by [Ericsson, China Telecom], the existing scheduling rule should be kept for PUSCH.

From moderator perspective:

1. According to existing process, only HARQ feedback disabling for the DL transmission is agreed, no additional enhancement has been considered for UL transmission.

*Agreement:*

*Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling*

Agreement from RAN2#112e:

1. From RAN2 perspective, for dynamic grant, one possibility for “enabling”/”disabling” HARQ uplink retransmission at UE transmitter is without introducing an additional mechanism (i.e. Gnb can send grant with NDI not toggled/toggled without waiting for decoding result of previous PUSCH transmission). FFS on the handling of RTT timers. Other solutions for enabling/disabling HARQ UL reTX are not precluded
2. In the existing specification, w.r.t the PUSCH scheduling, followings are defined in 38.214:

*The UE is not expected to be scheduled to transmit another PUSCH by DCI format 0\_0, 0\_1 or 0\_2 scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of the last PUSCH for that HARQ process.*

*If the first uplink symbol in the PUSCH allocation for a transport block, including the DM-RS, as defined by the slot offset K2 and the start and length indicator SLIV of the scheduling DCI and including the effect of the timing advance, is no earlier than at symbol L2, where* *L2 is defined as the next uplink symbol with its CP starting* $T\_{proc,2}$ *after the end of the reception of the last symbol of the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling the PUSCH, then the UE shall transmit the transport block.*

Based on the above analysis, it’s clear that for enabling the consecutive transmission with same HARQ process, e.g., retransmission, no additional enhancement for the PUSCH scheduling is needed comparing to terrestrial network. Companies are encourage to justify the necessity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | From the spec text, it seems to say that second DCI scheduling a second PUSCH corresponding to the same HARQ process, should be received by the UE after the first PUSCH. We think this restriction is not suitable for disabled PUSCH transmission. The reason is that the Gnb does not have knowledge of exact UE-specific TA or UE specific RTT every time it schedules a PUSCH. Thus, the Gnb might not be able to ensure this timing relationship. Therefore, with this restriction, it imposes the Gnb to wait for a longer time to avoid this scheduling error case, contradicting the expected benefits from HARQ disabling.  |
| Vivo | For the sake of uplink throughput, the Gnb can transmit the DCI of scheduling a PUSCH for a given HARQ process before it receives the previous PUSCH transmission for the same HARQ process. But there should be a restriction on the time gap of the two DCIs for the same HARQ process. We think the time gap should be large or equal than the slot offset *K2* to avoid the confusion at the UE side. Although the uplink scheduling is up to network implementation, it is necessary for UE to keep the scheduling restriction on the timeline of the DCI reception of scheduling a PUSCH for a given HARQ process.  |
| CMCC | We share the same view to the FL, i.e., no additional enhancement for the PUSCH scheduling is needed. |
| ZTE | As agreed in RAN2, the consecutive UL scheduling with same HARQ process can be achieved up to the Gnb implementation. Any restriction can be taken by Gnb’s behaviour to achieve the required additional offset between two PUSCHs, e.g., T\_proc,2 for PUSCH preparation. |
| Thales | We share the moderator’s view : no need for scheduling enhancement on PUSCH |
| Apple | We do not think additional enhancement for PUSCH scheduling is needed beyond terrestrial network. Another PUSCH can be transmitted after the end of expected transmission of the last PUSCH for that HARQ process.  |
| Huawei | Our view is that no additional enhancement is needed for the PUSCH scheduling. “enabling”/”disabling” HARQ uplink retransmission as it can be supported by the existing protocol with NDI not toggled or toggled. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the analysis of the moderator. |
| MediaTek | We agree with moderator analysis, no additional enhancement is needed |
| Sharp | We agree with the moderator that no additional enhancement is needed. |
| Qualcomm | The first paragraph requires DCI of the second PUSCH (not the PUSCH itself) comes after later than the first PUSCH. This has been clarified. If the requirement is defined based on logic timing, then NW does not have to wait for a RTD to send the second DCI; otherwise, NW has to wait for a long period of time to send the second the DCI. Suppose the first paragraph is defined based on logic timing, a UE may be required to transmit two PUSCH back to back without any gap. This is apparently not desirable. That is why a time gap is needed. |
| CATT | This issue had been discussed in RAN2, so we support the analysis of the moderator.  |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We agree with the view of moderator. |
| Samsung | Agree - no need for any enhancement. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree with FL analysis. No need for specifying behaviour for UL scheduling. |
| APT | Agree with Moderator. No enhancement on HARQ uplink retransmission.  |

# **Restriction on HARQ feedback disabling**

In RAN1#102e meeting, following agreement has been achieved:

Agreement:

Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC ignalling

However, in current specification, some mechanisms, e.g., delivering MAC CE command, SPS release, depend on the ACK-NACK feedback. In this meeting, ***following views are summarized:***

1. MAC CE:

As highlighted by [APT, MTK, Sony, Ericsson, ZTE], further discussion is required for this issue. Both [MTK, Sony] prefer to send the LS to RAN2, and the following options can be included.

* Option 1: UE expects that at least one HARQ process for DL scheduling is configured for the scheduling of MAC-CE.
* Option 2: Up to Gnb’s implementation for scheduling

[Ericsson] highlights that UE does not expect a MAC CE activation/deactivation command, which would become effective 3 msec after the UE would transmit the corresponding HARQ-ACK, to be scheduled on a downlink HARQ process with disabled feedback. And [ZTE] mentioned that such restriction can be Gnb’s implementation.

1. SPS release:

As highlighted by [CAICT, CATT, ZTE, Sony, Apple], further discussion is required for this issue. More specifically, [CATT] highlights scheduling with feedback enabled HARQ process should be considered for SPS release and [Sony] prefer to allow the UE to conduct the ACK-NACK feedback even scheduled with feedback disabled HARQ process. [ZTE, CAICT] mention that the corresponding scheduling is up to Gnb configuration and [ZTE] prefer to deliver information via enabled HARQ process.

According to the above summary, it’s clear that resolving the potential mismatch between UE’s and Gnb’s behavior due to the introduction of feedback disabling is needed along with the discussion in previous meeting. Then, from moderator perspective, a unified solution for these cases is preferred as following proposal:

**[Initial Proposal 4]:**

For the transmission of MAC CE and SPS release, one of following is supported:

* Option-1: UE expects that at least one HARQ process is configured with HARQ feedback.
* Option-2: UE expects that MAC CE and SPS release information is scheduled via one HARQ process configured with HARQ feedback.
* Note: The Option 2 can be taken as Conclusion.

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Panasonic | Above options assumes Gnb uses HARQ enabled process for the MAC CE and SPS release information. But, we think whether to use HARQ enabled or disabled process for the transmission of MAC CE and SPS release should be up to Gnb implementation, as we mentioned in our contribution R1-2101024 for 8.4.1. When MAC CE is transmitted with HARQ disabled process, “slot used for the HARQ-ACK transmission” can be defined by K1 value in the DCI scheduling the HARQ disabled process as in HARQ enabled process. Therefore, we propose the following option. Option-3: whether to use HARQ enabled or disabled process for the transmission of MAC CE and SPS release is up to Gnb implementation. |
| OPPO | Option 1 can be decided later once the HARQ-ACK codebook design is clear. For the moment, it is not needed to add this configuration restriction. For option 2, it is not clear why SPS release is associated with HARQ process? In NR spec, no HARQ process is needed for receiving SPS release.  |
| LG | Slightly prefer Option -2. We think issue related to “SPS PDSCH activation” with HARQ-ACK disabled process also needs to be resolved.  |
| Vivo | Support option-2. |
| CMCC | Support option-2. |
| ZTE | Supportive for Option-2 to reduce the additional spec impact and efforts. W.r.t the Gnb implementation issue, it can be one possible way but with corresponding conclusion as Option-2 will avoid the potential error case.For the SPS related issue, in existing specification, the SPS transmission, e.g., reception of signalling for SPS activation, is up to the successful reception HARQ-ACK feedback from corresponding transmission. To avoid long term misunderstanding of SPS behaviour, it’s prefer to take the SPS related with enabled HARQ process. |
| Intel | In our understanding option 2 is supported by default since MAC CE and SPS release are not working without HARQ feedback.  |
| Thales | Support Option 2Agree with MTK to coordinate with RAN2 on this topic |
| Apple | We support Option 2 as a conclusion. Option 1 can be implied by Option 2.  |
| Huawei | Selecting from the two options is ok but the proposal is unclear. What is the purpose of the note taking option 2 as a conclusion? |
| Ericsson | In principle, we support MAC CE part in Option-2 but it should be clarified that it only applies to MAC CE with activation/deactivation command that becomes effective a given time after the sending of HARQ-ACK.SPS release has nothing to do with HARQ process with feedback enabled / disabled. For SPS release, UE does not read HARQ process ID field in the DCI. Can the proponent clarify why SPS release has to be sent on a HARQ process with feedback enabled? |
| MediaTek | Support Option 2 with MAC part  |
| Sharp | We share the similar with Panasonic. Whether to use HARQ enabled or disabled process for the transmission of MAC CE and SPS release should be up to Gnb implementation. |
| Spreadtrum | Support option-2. |
| Sony | We support MAC CE part in Option 2.On HARQ disabling, we think two aspects need to be considered.1. Impact of other procedures.
2. Signalling Reliability

As many companies mentioned, the UE action timelines are designed based on HARQ-ACK feedback time for MAC CE activation/release. However, signalling such as SPS release need HARQ-ACK for reliability, but it won’t impact other procedures. We prefer to keep MAC CE only in Initial Proposal 4 and discuss SPS PDSCH related issue separately. For SPS PDSCH, we would like to ask (1) Is it possible that a SPS configuration includes both HARQ-ACK disabled HARQ process and HARQ-ACK enabled HARQ process? (2) The scheduling restrictions for dynamic PDSCH also work for SPS PDSCH? |
| Qualcomm | Support Option 2. |
| CATT | Support option 2. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 2 |
| InterDigital | Support Option 2 |
| ChinaTelecom | Support Option 2. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We support Option 2 as a conclusion. |
| Samsung | No need for any agreement. It is up to the gNB configuration - any agreement will unnecessarily restrict what the gNB/NTN can do. |
| CAICT | Basically support option-2. SPS release information has no related HARQ process, but should has corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | The enabling and disabling of HARQ feedback is the responsibility of the gNB, and there should not be any limitations or restrictions as to which HARQ process is having the HARQ feedback disabled. Hence, we are strongly supporting option 2, which can be taken as a conclusion. |
| APT | Support [Initial Proposal 4].As pointed out by other companies, this agreement may be difficult to implement into specs simply replied on RAN1. Sending a LS to RAN2 shall be considered. |

# **Performance enhancements**

For enhancing the performance of transmission, in last meeting, different solutions including potential parameters configurations are proposed by companies. In this meeting, following aspects are categorized into following aspects according to the views from each company:

1. Enhancements on aggregated transmission (including repetition)
	* Larger aggregation factor:

As highlighted by [CATT, ETRI, ZTE], supports of the larger aggregation factor is beneficial for NTN.

* + Indication of aggregation factor:

[Ericsson, Lenovo, ETRI] prefer to introduce different configurations for the transmission via HARQ process with enabled or disabled feedback.

Meanwhile, DCI based indication for the repetition/aggregation related information is mentioned by [Huawei, Ligado, Lenovo, Samsung].

* + Transmission scheme:

In case of supports on larger aggregation factor, the time-interleaved transmission is mentioned in [CATT, CMCC]. Moreover, as results shown in [ZTE], performance gain can be achieved for the transmission with reduced DM-RS density. [Panasonic] proposes to introduce the scaling factor for TBS determination. And joint transmission with channel estimation cross slot is proposed by [OPPO].

1. Enhancements on CQI table with new BLER

A new CQI table with larger BLER e.g., 1% [InterDigital] is proposed by [InterDigital, Qualcomm]. But this part is not preferred by [ZTE] since similar performance can be achieved by implementation of scheduling, and also not needed as highlighted by [Thales] for NTN GEO scenario.

1. Blind retransmission

As highlighted by [OPPO, Thales, Apple], supports on blind PDSCH (re)transmission of the same packet by MAC scheduling without waiting for the transmission of the HARQ feedback can be considered.

1. UCI

As highlighted in [Xiaomi, Qualcomm, ETRI], in case of scheduling with disabled HARQ feedback, additional new UCI feedback, e.g., to report the decoding statistic or reporting DL transmission disruption and/or requesting DL scheduling changes, can be considered to improve the scheduling configuration from gNB side.

1. UE assistance information

As mentioned in [Samsung, Huawei], report for the assist information from UE side, e.g., the buffer situation in the DL HARQ procedure [Samsung] via reserved resource [Huawei], is beneficial for scheduling the decision for HARQ scheduling with enabled/disabled feedback.

In addition, other solutions, e.g., priority order for transmission [CAICT]., RV limitation for scheduling [QC] and TB size scaling [Panasonic], is proposed by proponent. No enhancement on MCS is highlighted by [CATT].

Based on the above analysis, following proposal is provided according to majority view:

**[Initial Proposal 5]:**

Study on following enhancements is prioritized:

* Enhancements on aggregated transmission (including repetition)
* Enhancements on MCS (including CQI report)

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Panasonic  | We are fine to discuss above two aspects. * Aggregated transmission (including repetition)

The number of repetitions up to 16 is supported in Rel.16. Although the necessity of the larger value is not yet clear, enhancement supported in coverage enhancement WI can be applied if needed. Repetition can be used to improve user throughput together with TB size scaling especially for Ka-band where slot length is small. For example, RTT up to 335 slots is observed in case of LEO 1200km with SCS 120kHz. Apparently, up to 32 processes restrict too much the transmission opportunities within RTT and degrade user throughput. By PDSCH/PUSCH transmission with TB size scaled with the number of repetitions (e.g. 4x TB size for 4x repetitions), user throughput is significantly improved as shown in our simulation results in R1-2101025. Note that similar benefit can be obtained by multi-slot transmission discussed in coverage enhancement WI. it can be considered to apply the same solution as multi-slot PUSCH in coverage enhancement WI for both PUSCH and PDSCH in NTN.* MCS (CQI) enhancement

The purpose of the enhancement seems to realize lower BLER transmission (e.g. 1 or 0.1%). We think lower BLER can be achieved by gNB’s MCS selection using the existing CQI/MCS tables.  |
| OPPO | We think blind retransmission is an important solution to enhance the performance, which is not sub-ordinary to aggregated transmission. We propose that blind retransmission should have the same priority as aggregated transmission for the discussion. Proposed modification on initial proposalStudy on following enhancements is prioritized:* Enhancements on aggregated transmission (including repetition)
* Enhancements on blind retransmission.
* Enhancements on MCS (including CQI report)
 |
| LG | Regarding first sub-bullet, it is ok for prioritization. But, for second sub-bullet, the benefit is not clear.  |
| vivo | Agree to study the enhancements on aggregated transmission. However, we think enhancements on MCS should be deprioritized. Actually, in current specification, there are several MCS tables with low and high spectral efficiency and reliability to satisfy various NR scenarios and cases. In our understanding, these MCS levels are enough to cover NTN scenarios and cases by network implementation. Thus, enhancements on MCS should be deprioritized. |
| CMCC | Agree to study the enhancements on aggregated transmission. |
| ZTE | Prefer to take 1st the sub-bullet as higher priority and only target for the DL. W.r.t the potential solution for UL, more solid assumption and updated baseline should be considered along with the progress in CE WI. |
| Intel | On the enhancements on aggregated transmission, in our view overlap with coverage enhancement WI should be avoided. Regarding the new MCS/CQI table, in our view it is not necessary at least in this release. |
| Thales | Support to prioritize studies on enhancements on aggregated transmission and MCS.Blind retransmissions benefits should also be investigated. |
| Apple  | We think the blind retransmission is also important for HARQ process with disabled feedback. It may be studied together with aggregated transmission. Also, considering the spec. impact and no clear performance improvement, we do not prefer the enhancement on MCS (CQI report).  |
| Huawei | Support the first bullet of prioritizing aggregated transmission. With regards to the second bullet, there is no need to introduce new MCS or CQI table as the current tables are sufficient. If new BLER target is needed, e.g. 1%, the performance can be achieved by selecting a lower MCS, e.g. apply an offset to the selected MCS or CQI by the existing table with BLER target of 0.1%. |
| Ericsson | We do not think such prioritization is necessary. Companies can contribute based on their interest and preferably justify their proposals with convincing evaluation results. If there is consensus on a particular proposal, there will be agreement naturally. |
| Ligado | We support studying aggregated transmissions and blind repetition, particularly adaptive blind repetition.  |
| MediaTek | Support enhancements on aggregated transmission (including repetition). It can be small impact on the specifications.  |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Prefer to take enhancements on aggregated transmission (including repetition) as higher priority. |
| Sony | Support Initial Proposal 5. |
| CATT | For aggregation transmission enhancement, it can be studied further.For CQI enhancement, we don’t see the need. |
| Xiaomi | For the second bullet, it needs more clarification. |
| ChinaTelecom | Agree to enhance the aggregated transmission |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We share the similar view as vivo. Enhancements on aggregated transmission and repetition should be prioritized. It is not so sensitive to the MCS table for NTN compared with URLLC case and it is hard to define a target requirement (BLER 1% or 0.1%?) |
| Samsung | We prefer to further discuss the UE assistance information as it is the most critical of all listed issues.  |
| ETRI | We prefer to study both the enhancements on aggregated transmission and UCI (UL feedback). Regarding larger aggregation factor (value of aggregation factor), according to our simulation, if more challenging target BLER than 10-2 is required, larger aggregation factor might be needed to cover NTN scenario. Regarding the different aggregation factor configuration (Indication of aggregation factor), the different aggregation factor configuration might be useful to obtain the desired performance.Regarding the UCI (guide of aggregation factor), according to our simulation, not only IMCS but also the aggregation factor should be changeable for getting optimal adaptation. Unless the aggregation factor is changed, the throughput loss might be approximately from 15% to 60%. (loss might be different depending on the scenario).Thus, new UL feedback should be introduced as a guide of aggregation factor to resolve the non-optimality of aggregated transmission. Moreover, we think that new UL feedback could be discussed in combination with aggregated transmission and it does not need to be excluded. Regarding the feedback method, MAC-CE/RRC might be more beneficial than the UCI because the retransmission mechanism on PUSCH might be applied for compensating lower S(I)NR in UL, which are more challenging than DL. |
| CAICT | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | As pointed out in the GTW session, such enhancements are to be seen as enhancements on a situation where the gNB has deliberately deteriorated the system (by disabling the HARQ feedback). In such a situation, the gNB still have sufficient means for adapting the link. The gNB will still be able to get HARQ-ACK feedback on the general link performance from the non-disabled processes. The gNB does also have the possibility to use more conservative MCS when scheduling for a HARQ process with disabled feedback. These enhancements should be studied with low priority, and only if time allows. |
| APT | Support **[Initial Proposal 5].** Some simulation-based evaluations shall be encouraged for the next meeting. |

# **Summary for the 1st round discussion**

# **#Issues-1: Enhanced HARQ process ID indication**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal 1 in section 2, in the 1st round discussion, 25 companies are provided views, more specifically,

* Up to [8] companies [Huawei, Sharp, Sony, Qualcomm, CATT, Xiaomi, Samsung, Nokia] prefer to a unified indication for both fallback DCI and non-FB DCI.
	+ [OPPO] is only supportive for a unified indication for non-FB DCI

W.r.t the detailed views of each companies, following table is provided with corresponding statistic:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DCI format/views | Option-1 | Option-1a | Option-2 | Option-3 | No enhancement/not supportive |
| 0-2/1-2 | (4)Huawei, Sony, Qualcomm, Xiaomi | (3)Sony, Qualcomm, Xiaomi | (4)ZTE, Apple, Huawei, ETRI, MTK | (14)vivo,CMCC , Ericsson, Spreadtrum , InterDigital, ChinaTelecom ,LG, CATT, Samsung,CAICT, ETRI, Nokia, Apple, APT, MTK |  |
| 0-1/1-1 | (6) Intel, Huawei, Sony, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Lenovo&MotoM | (5)Intel, Sony, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Lenovo&MotoM | (4)ZTE, Huawei, ChinaTelecom, ETRI, MTK | (11)LG,vivo,CMCC, Ericsson, Spreadtrum,CATT, InterDigital, Samsung, CAICT,Nokia, MTK, [Lenovo&MotoM] -second preference | (1) APT |
| 0-0/1-0 | (3) Sony,Qualcomm, Xiaomi | (3)Sony,Qualcomm, Xiaomi | (4)ZTE, Apple, ChinaTelecom, ETRI | (6)CMCC, Spreadtrum, CATT, Samsung, CAICT,Nokia | (7) Panasonic, LG, Intel, Ericsson, InterDigital, Lenovo&MotoM, APT, MTK |

For this topic, based on the discussion, from moderator perspective, it seems that majority share the supportive for non-fallback DCI and more discussion is needed for fallback cases. Meanwhile, from solution perspective, clear majority is identified for Option-3 w.r.t the DCI 0-2/1-2, which is aligned with 1st bullet of moderator’s proposal. For DCI 0-1/1-1, views are diverged.

Then, following updated proposal can be considered for further discussion, especially for the yellow marked part:

**[Updated Proposal 1]:**

Enhancement on the HARQ process indication is supported as:

* For DCI 0-2/1-2:
	+ Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits
* For DCI 0-1/1-1, at least one of following is supported:
	+ Option 1: Slot index as the MSB
	+ Option 1-a:Slot index as the LSB
	+ Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
	+ Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits
* FFS: DCI 0-0/1-0

Companies are encourage to provide the views w.r.t the proposal above:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| vivo | For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support the proposal.For DCI 0-1/1-1, we prefer the Option 3. For DCI 0-0/1-0, we agree to restrict the application of 32 HARQ processes on DCI 0-0/1-0. |
| Panasonic | We support updated proposal 1. For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support Option 3. For DCI 0-1/1-1, we prefer Option 3 as well for simplicity and commonality with DCI 0-2/1-2. For DCI 0-0/1-0, our preference is no enhancement considering the fallback usage.  |
| Huawei | With respect to DCI 0-2/1-2, considering that it is specified in 38.212 that the field of HARQ process number is determined by higher layer parameter *HARQProcessNumberSize-ForDCIFormat0/1-2*, option-3 is reasonable. Nevertheless, we see the benefit of adopting a unified approach over all of the DCI sets, so we hesitate to agree only on the approach for DCI 0-2/1-2 in isolation from the other DCIs. |
| OPPO | We are not ok with this proposal. First of all, what is the use case for DCI x\_2 in NTN? Note that R16 introduced DCI x\_2 for URLLC case, do we need to support URLLC in NTN? Even in R16, HARQ process field cannot be greater than 4 bits. As we commented in the previous round, we prefer a unified design. Thus, we propose to use slot index as MSB for both DCI x\_1 and x\_2.  |
| CMCC | We support updated proposal 1. For DCI 0-1/1-1, we prefer the Option 3.  |
| APT | Support **[Updated Proposal 1]**.For DCI 0-1/1-1, Option 3For DCI 0-0/1-0, No enhancement/not supportive |
| Samsung | OK because this is as far as we can probably go for now.Another issue to consider is why, given DCI format 0\_2/1\_2, there is any need for DCI format 0\_1/1\_1.  |
| Ericsson | DCI 0-2/1-2: AgreeDCI 0-1/1-1: Slot index-based process ID should be avoided since it reintroduces scheduling restrictions of LTE.DCI 0-0/1-0: Fallback DCI format should not be changed for backward compatibility reasons. Note that fallback DCI is used to schedule SIB. RAN2 has not yet agreed how the UE knows whether a network is NTN or TN but a natural solution would be to signal it in SIB. This means that the UE does not know whether the network is NTN before reading SIB. So DCI scheduling SIB must use the legacy format or double decoding will be needed. If DCI scheduling SIB uses the legacy fallback DCI format and DCI scheduling user data uses a new fallback DCI format, double decoding will also be needed. |
| LG | DCI 0-2/1-2: AgreeDCI 0-1/1-1: Option 3DCI 0-0/1-0: We agree with Ericsson that fall back DCI should not be changed. But, for the sake of progress, we are ok with FFS for DCI 0-0/1-0.  |
| CAICT | DCI 0-1/1-1 and 0-2/1-2: option3.DCI 0-0/1-0: Option 3 or no enhancement. |
| MediaTek | DCI 0-2/1-2: AgreeDCI 0-1/1-1: Option 3DCI 0-0/1-0: FFS (preference for no enhancement for backward compatibility between TN and NTN. UE needs to read SIB with fallback DCI to know which type of network it is; also needed for UE capability for NTN). |
| Xiaomi | We still prefer to have unified solution for all the DCI formats. Meanwhile, for the fallback DCI, our understanding is that given the strict link budget condition, fallback DCI should be used in most cases in NTN scenarios. In this sense, we prefer to have implicit way to indicate 32 HARQ processes. |
| Spreadtrum | We support updated proposal 1.DCI 0-1/1-1: Prefer Option 3 |
| ETRI | For DCI 0-2/1-2: AgreeFor DCI 0-1/1-1: Option 2For DCI 0-0/1-0: Option 2 or no enhancement |
| CATT | In general, we prefer one unified solution.For DCI 0-2/1-2, we support the proposal.For DCI 0-1/1-1, we prefer the Option 3. For DCI 0-0/1-0, we can support extending to 5 bits for 32 HARQ processes or only using 4 bits DCI as legacy specification.  |
| ZTE | For DCI 0-2/1-2: AgreeFor DCI 0-1/1-1: Option 2 is preferred with less restriction on the scheduling and impacts on DCI formatFor DCI 0-0/1-0: Option 2 is preferred to enhance it. For sake of progress, it can be kept as FFS. |
| Intel | The proposal is reasonable in our view. For DCI 0-1/1-1, our preference is Option 1 or Option 1a.DCI 0-0/1-0 can be discussed further. |

# **#Issues-2: HARQ codebook enhancement**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-2 in section 3, in the 1st round discussion, 24 companies are provided views. More specifically,

* Up to [6] companies [Panasonic, LG, ZTE, Intel, Sharp, Lenovo] are supportive to the initial proposal from moderator.

Meanwhile, detailed views for each sub-bullet corresponding to each HARQ codebook is listed below:

* Type-1 HARQ codebook
1. Up to [17] companies [OPPO, Panasonic, LG, vivo, CMCC, ZTE, Intel, Thales, Apple, Spreadtrum, CATT, Xiaomi, InterDigital, China Telecom, Lenovo, CAICT, Nokia] are supportive to moderator’s proposal without additional enhancement;
2. In additional, companies still prefer to introduce certain enhancement with following two options
	1. Option-2: Report NACK on disabled process [Ericsson, Qualcomm, Samsung]
	2. Option-3: Reduce codebook size with criteria [Huawei, Sony, Qualcomm]
		1. As one specific case for Type-1 HARQ codebook, [CMCC, vivo] prefer to omit the HARQ-ACK report if only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted.
* Type-2 HARQ codebook
1. Up to [20] companies [OPPO, Panasonic, LG, vivo, CMCC, ZTE, Intel, Thales, Apple, Huawei, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, Sony, CATT, Xiaomi, InterDigital, China Telecom, Lenovo, CAICT, APT] are supportive to moderator’s recommendation.
	1. In addition, [Nokia] prefer to discuss it with more details and [Apple, vivo, CMCC, Thales, Ericsson, Qualcomm] show their preference on how to count the C-DAI and T-DAI in case of disabling.
* Type-3 HARQ codebook
1. Up to [13] companies [Panasonic, LG,ZTE, Intel, Xiaomi, vivo, Thales, Huawei, Ericsson, Qualcomm, China Telecom, CAICT, APT] are supportive to enhance the Type-3 codebook with Alt-2 listed in moderator’s proposal:
	1. Alt: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes [vivo, Thales, Huawei, Ericsson, Qualcomm, China Telecom, CAICT, APT]
2. However, there are still [5] companies [OPPO, Sony, CATT, Nokia, Samsung] are negative to discuss Type-3 codebook for NTN, but [Nokia] is also open for enhancement.

In additional, [Panasonic, LG, ZTE] have discuss the meaning of “no enhancement” listed in the moderator’s proposal.

For this topic, based on the discussion, from moderator perspective, the main intention for the introduction of corresponding enhancement is to reduce the feedback overhead in case of scheduling via HARQ process with disabled feedback. Meanwhile, additional restriction on the scheduling flexibility should also not be introduced. Then,

1. W.r.t the Type-1 codebook:

The solution to report NACK on disabled process may not be the good choice since no benefits on the feedback overhead is foreseen. For the option with certain criteria, it seems that the case mentioned by [CMCC, vivo] is reasonable, which can be taken as baseline for discussion.

1. W.r.t the Type-2 codebook:

The views are aligned among companies, the original proposal can be taken as recommendation.

1. W.r.t the Type-3 codebook:

According to the UE feature discussion in RAN1#103e meeting, it has been agreed that the Type-3 is still applicable for licensed spectrum. So from specification perspective, it’s not reasonable to preclude the usage of certain feature. And potential enhancement can still be considered to optimize the performance in new use case.

Moreover, w.r.t the FFS on SPS related issue, the general analysis of existing specification is listed in section 7.4 for issue 4. It’s more suitable to take the SPS release DCI topic in this section and other in section 7.4, companies are still encourage to provide the view here to address the FSS.

Moreover, according to the email discussion, following cases are listed for further discussion of Type-1 codebook enhancement:

* Case-1: All HARQ process (e.g., X = 16 or 32) for one UE are configured as disabled.
* Case-2: All HARQ process used for scheduling in  are disabled and all DCIs successfully decoded by UE (i.e., no ambiguity between gNB and UE)；
* Case-3: All HARQ process used for scheduling in  are disabled, but mis-detection on the DCI occurs at UE side (i.e., there is ambiguity between gNB and UE)；
* Case-4: Partial HARQ process used for scheduling in  are disabled regardless whether mis-detection on the DCI occurs at UE side or not;

 Then, following updated proposal is considered for further discussion, especially on the yellow marked part:

**[Proposal 2]:**

For the following HARQ codebook in NTN:

* Type-1 HARQ codebook:

If only disabled HARQ process are used for scheduling in occasions, no HARQ-ACK feedback is expected at UE side. Otherwise, legacy behavior is assumed.

* Type-2 HARQ codebook: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes
	+ FFS: the details of C-DAI and T-DAI counting for DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enable/disabled HARQ processes
* Type-3 HARQ codebook: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes
* FFS: DCI for SPS release.

*#======*

According to the online discussion, following agreement have been made:

Agreement:

For Type-2 HARQ codebook in NTN: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only including HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes

* FFS: The details of C-DAI and T-DAI counting for DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enable/disabled HARQ processes

*#======*

W.r.t the remaining issue for other codebook Types including DCI for SPS release, following proposal is listed:

**[Updated Proposal 2]:**

For the following HARQ codebook in NTN:

* Type-1 HARQ codebook:

If only disabled HARQ process are used for scheduling in occasions, no HARQ-ACK feedback is expected at UE side. Otherwise, legacy behavior is assumed.

* Type-3 HARQ codebook: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes
* FFS: DCI for SPS release.

Companies are encourage to provide the views w.r.t the proposal above:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Apple | Type-1 HARQ codebook: we do not support the case of “only disabled HARQ process are used”. How does a UE know if only disabled HARQ processes are used in case of DTX? Type-3 HARQ codebook: we assume the NDI values for feedback-disabled HARQ processes are also not included in the codebook. If so, we may clarify it in the proposal.  |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Although our first preference is no enhancement for all types of HARQ codebook, we are ok with no enhancement for type 1 and reduced codebook for type 2 and 3 as suggested for the sake of progress. Regarding the condition in type 1, we don’t see the need of such optimization. We prefer just to follow the legacy behaviour (i.e. no enhancement) for type 1. For DCI for SPS release, no enhancement (i.e. UE provide HARQ-ACK for SPS release as in current specification) would be sufficient. But, we are also ok with FFS at this moment.  |
| Huawei | For Type1, we can see that we are in minority in seeing the benefit of reduced codebook size.For Type-2 and Type-3 codebook, we agree with the proposed text in Proposal 2. |
| OPPO | We are not ok with the updated proposal.For type 1, enhancement is not needed for overhead reduction, if gNB seeks for low overhead, it should use type 2. For type 3, we have provided our concerns and we don’t see any benefits. But our concerns are addressed by the updated proposal. We reinsert our concern below. For type 3, we question its benefit compared with type 1 and type 2. We have the followings concerns:1. In the current specification, type 3 cannot be configured alone but jointly configured with type 1 or type 2, which means that the UE cannot be configured to only report type 3.
2. Type 3 was introduced in NRU WI in order to benefit from the HARQ-ACK retransmission due to LBT failure. However, this benefit does not exist in NTN because the initial HARQ-ACK transmission can always be realized. Moreover, once the initial HARQ-ACK transmission is conducted, type 3 codebook only contains invalid NACK, which does not provide any information to the network.
3. Type 3 has larger codebook overhead, type 2 codebook is much more efficient than type 3.

With the above reasons, we don’t support type 3 codebook in NTN. |
| CMCC | For Type1, we support the proposal. In our view, a UE may always try to construct Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook according to the legacy behaviour when it received a HARQ process. Nevertheless, if only disabled HARQ processes were received, the UE will not expect to report the HARQ-ACK codebook.For Type2, we support the proposal. Regarding FFS, - In the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given a reserved value that can be ignored by the UE.- Furthermore, the C-DAI and T-DAI field in the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes may be removed or reinterpreted.  |
| APT | For Type1, **not support** to change its size. We appropriate the intention for overhead reduction. **However**, in principle, Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook shall not change its size to facilitate UE implementation and NW scheduling. For Type2, **support**. For Type3, **respect** the group. For DCI for SPS release, **support** moderator’s proposal in in section 7.4 |
| Samsung | For Type-2, we support.For Type-1, we do not support.The reason is same as mentioned by Apple – the UE does not know. Type-1 does not rely on DCI format detection.For Type-3, we do not support. Type-3 is an optional UE feature that will be always worse than Type-2 which is a mandatory UE feature. No need to spend time or specify any optimizations. |
| Ericsson | For Type-1 HARQ codebook: We have some doubts on the “If only disabled HARQ process are used” part. The UE cannot know if only disabled HARQ processes are used unless it successfully decodes all DCI, but there are many cases that UE would miss DCIs, which will create misaligned understanding between gNB and UE on the feedback We propose the following for Type-1:* Type-1 HARQ codebook:

A solution will be down-selected from these options:* + Option-1: Legacy behaviour is assumed;
	+ Option-2: Report ACK/NACK on enabled processes and NACK on all other processes

We are fine with the other parts of the proposal. |
| LG | For Type-1 HARQ codebook: As we expressed our view several times through email, we see the benefit from Type-1 codebook size reduction especially in case of all HARQ processes in a certain cell are disabled. We are fine with the other part of the proposal. |
| CAICT | For Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook, we also have concern about possible DCI misdetection which is for enabled HARQ process scheduling. The codebook size of Type 1 HARQ-ACK should be independent of DCI detection.For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, C-DAI, T-DAI and other HARQ-ACK feedback related bit fields could be removed from the corresponding DCI or be used as other indication.For Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook, basically agree the proposal. Besides, it is noticed Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook was supported by DCI 1\_1 for unlicensed band while not supported by DCI 1-2 or 1\_0. When Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook is applied in licensed band, also only DCI 1\_1 could be used. This may translates to some restriction.  |
| MediaTek | For Type-1 HARQ Codebook, the agreement does not preclude other otions. We propose- Option 3: Report ACK/NACK on enabled processes and NACK on all other processesThis option 3 is closest to legacy behaviour as there is no change to the HARQ feedback on PUCH, and UE will simply report NACK on disable processes.  |
| Xiaomi | For type 1 codebook, we don’t support the proposal, we don’t see the need that UE’s codebook construction is dependent on the detected DCIFor type 3 codebook, more clarification on the use case of type 3 HARQ codebook in NTN scenario is needed. |
| CATT | For Type-1 HARQ codebook, we do not support the case of “only disabled HARQ processes are used”. For Type-3 HARQ codebook, not sure why we need push it again and again. For NTN, we don’t see its necessity. |
| ZTE | For the Type-1 HARQ codebook, more discussion for each case including understanding for potential UE’s and gNB’s behaviour is needed. One way to updated is :* Type-1 HARQ codebook:

At least, If only disabled HARQ process are used for scheduling in occasions with successful DCI decoding at UE side, no HARQ-ACK feedback is expected at UE side. Otherwise, legacy behavior is assumed.For the Type-3 and FFS for SPS, supportive for the proposal.  |
| Intel | As some other companies, we are not sure if enhancement proposed for Type I codebook provides robustness against misdetection of DCI(s).  |

# **#Issues-3: PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling restriction**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-3 in section 4 (for PDSCH), in the 1st round discussion, 21 companies are provided views, more specifically,

* Up to [18] companies [Panasonic, OPPO, LG, vivo, CMCC, ZTE, Intel, Thales, Apple, Huawei, MediaTek, Sharp, Spreadtrum, Sony, China Telecom, Samsung, Nokia, APT] are supportive to the initial Proposal from moderator.

In addition:

1. [CATT] still has concern on the original note and prefer to preclude the case with same TB;
2. [Ericsson] prefer to further reduce the value of X comparing to the $T\_{proc,1}$ to exclude the HARQ-ACK generation time, but even more relaxed timing is proposed by QC as X=max (Tproc,1, Tslot\*k) to ensure same processing timeline between two type of HARQ processes.

For this topic, based on the discussion, from moderator perspective,

1. W.r.t the TB:

From scheduling perspective, whether same or different TB will be reused is up to gNB’s scheduling, it’s prefer to keep the corresponding flexibility. At UE side, whether UE is able to combine the two consecutive transmission of same TB from same HARQ is up to UE’s implementation. As the baseline operation, the UE can flush the buffer in case of scheduling with disabled HARQ process for PDSCH regardless of whether same TB will be transmitted later.

1. W.r.t the value of X:

As the majority’s view, reusing of $T\_{proc,1}$ can be accepted as the compromise solution to minimize the spec impact with relative relaxed requirement for UE. For the argument “to ensure same processing timeline between two type of HARQ processes”, it seems not be convincible since the even in NR, the UE should be able to fulfill the timeline defined in specification, i.e., dl-DataToUL-ACK can be equate as 0 according to IE definition in 38.331:

dl-DataToUL-ACK SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..8)) OF INTEGER (0..15)

Then, according to the online discussion, following agreement is achieved:

**[Initial Proposal 3]:**

For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until $T\_{proc,1}$ after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.

* Note: The TB of the two PDSCHs can be either same or different

Companies are encourage to provide the views if there is strong concern w.r.t the proposal above:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| vivo | Support. |
| Panasonic | Support Proposal 3. |
| Huawei | We agree with proposal 3.As we commented on the reflector regarding the note, our understanding is hat the UE should be able to combine the same two TBs even when the HARQ process is disabled. This is the current NR procedure and does not require a higher UE capability. The soft buffer size would have to be dimensioned to match the UE capability. It is not evident that the UE needs to flush the soft buffer for a disabled HARQ process once a decoding is done. |
| CMCC | We support the proposal. |
| APT | Support **[Initial Proposal 3]** |

Finally, during the online discussion, the following agreement is achieved:

Agreement:

For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until X after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.

* Working assumption: X = T\_proc,1
* FFS: Whether X should be changed to X = max(T\_proc,1, K1) where K1 is the minimum k1 if it is configured, otherwise k1 = 0
* Note: The TB of the two PDSCHs can be either same or different

#===================================================================================

W.r.t the PUSCH related discussion, up to [12] companies provide the views, more specifically,

* Up to [13] companies [CMCC, ZTE, Thales, Apple, Huawei, Ericsson, MTK, Sharp, CATT, Lenovo, Nokia, APT] are supportive to original analysis of moderator.

But still, [OPPO, vivo, Qualcomm] highlights the need for additional restriction. From moderator’s perspective, it seems that the views from each companies are still same as previous meeting. Then, for the proponent of additional enhancement, more offline discussion with other companies are recommended. If there is changes on the situation, we can come back to this issue later.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| vivo | We have no concern about the scheduling restriction of PUSCH. Additional enhancement is no need. |
| OPPO | We think FL may mis-understood our comments. Our comment is not to suggest adding additional restriction. But rather we think the current specification has a restriction which is not needed for disabled PUSCH scheduling and should be removed. The restriction is when a PUSCH with a given HARQ process is scheduled by a DCI, another DCI that schedules a subsequent PUSCH with the same HARQ process should be received after transmitting the first PUSCH. This restriction is not needed for disabled PUSCH scheduling, otherwise, the Gnb has to hold the DCI.  |

# **#Issues-4: Restriction on the HARQ feedback disabling**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-4 in section 5, in the 1st round discussion, 25 companies are provided views, more specifically,

* Up to [16] companies [vivo, CMCC, ZTE, Intel, Thales, Apple, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, CATT, Xiaomi, InterDigital, China Telecom, Lenovo, CAICT, Nokia, APT] are supportive to take the Option 2 for both MAC CE signalling and SPS related scheduling.
	+ But Up to 3 companies [Ericsson, MTK, Sony] only prefer to keep the Option 2 for MAC CE signaling only.
	+ Meanwhile, [Nokia, Lenovo] prefer to take it as conclusion, but [Huawei] has concerns for clarification.

Moreover, [Panasonic] propose another as below for both MAC CE and SPS issue and Sharp is also supportive on this for SPS related issue.

Option-3: whether to use HARQ enabled or disabled process for the transmission of MAC CE and SPS release is up to gNB implementation.

In addition, w.r.t the SPS related, both [OPPO, Ericsson] require the clarification on SPS issue. And [LG, Sony] also highlight that additional discussion on the SPS configuration with HARQ-ACK disabled process should be considered.

For this topic, based on the discussion, from moderator perspective,

1. W.r.t the MAC CE

Since this topic has been discussed for several meetings, and according to existing specification, the misunderstanding of MAC CE signalling will occur without corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback from UE side w.r.t the PDSCH carrying the signaling. Then, to avoid the potential error case, it’s better to mandate the scheduling with enabled HARQ process.

1. W.r.t the SPS issue

In existing specification, following two issues needed to be considered for SPS:

1. SPS PDSCH transmission including SPS activation:

W.r.t the SPS activation, in current spec, there is no additional requirement for the HARQ-ACK feedback after the reception of corresponding DCI since the corresponding confirmation can be implicated known at gNB side by the reception of HARQ-ACK following-up SPS PDSCH reception. In this way, once the UE is failed to detect activation DCI without corresponding feedback, continuous error will occur for PDSCH transmission. Then, it’s preferred to keep all configured HARQ processes (based on the calculation of MAC as specified in 38.321) for SPS PDSCH transmission with enabled feedback.

1. SPS release

W.r.t the SPS release DCI, according to current specification, “a UE is expected to provide HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH release after N symbols from the last symbol of a PDCCH providing the SPS PDSCH release”. Since this topic is more related to the Issue-2 for HARQ codebook generation, it’s preferred to be handled in corresponding section.

W.r.t whether to take it as conclusion or agreement, it’s up to group’s understanding on whether to introduce corresponding specification changes.

Then, the following updated proposal can be considered:

 **[Updated Proposal 4] for conclusion:**

UE expects that PDSCH carrying MAC CE signalling and SPS PDSCH are scheduled via HARQ process(es) configured with HARQ feedback.

Companies are encourage to provide the views w.r.t the proposal above:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Apple | We suggest removing SPS PDSCH from the proposal. We understand the motivation of “SPS PDSCH are scheduled via HARQ process(es) with feedback enabled”. However, we have not had lots of discussions on SPS PDSCH yet. The “SPS PDSCH associated with feedback enabled HARQ processes” is not the only solution to the issue of missing acknowledgement of SPS activation. Considering up to 8 HARQ processes can be associated with a SPS configuration, having all these HARQ processes in a SPS configuration with feedback enabled may not align with the initial motivation of disabling HARQ feedback design in NTN.  |
| vivo | We suggest to revise the SPS PDSCH into SPS release. SPS PDSCH needs further study. |
| Panasonic | We are not supportive for proposal 4. It would not be desired to mandate gNB to use HARQ-enabled process to transmit MAC CE or SPS PDSCH. This would be unnecessary restriction on gNB operation. For example, it is not possible to simply use only HARQ-disabled transmission for a UE by configuring disable for all HARQ processes. Another example is that when gNB had scheduled all HARQ-enabled processes for the UE, gNB would have to wait the MAC CE transmission until (re)transmissions for a TB is completed (take at least RTT). It should be up to gNB’s implementation how to ensure reliability of MAC CE or SPS PDSCH by using HARQ-enabled process or using HARQ-disabled process with lower MCS. |
| Huawei | We agree with this conclusion. |
| OPPO | This topic is not essential, we should discuss this after the HARQ-ACK codebook design is clear.  |
| CMCC | We agree with this conclusion. |
| APT | Support **[Updated Proposal 4**]. As always, we still have concern how to implement this in RAN1 and RAN2 specs. Prefer a LS to RAN2. |
| Samsung | Do not support. It is completely a gNB implementation choice – NW behavior cannot be specified. |
| Ericsson | Regarding MAC CE: Not all MAC CE need to be sent with HARQ feedback enabled. Only if their associated activation/deactivation time is coupled to the transmission time of the HARQ ACK. E.g., TAC sent in MAC CE should not require a feedback enabled HARQ process.Regarding SPS: The reason for having a statement about MAC CE is that the specification would be ambiguous if the UE receives a MAC CE command whose activation/deactivation time depends on the timing of a HARQ ACK that is never sent. For SPS, there is no specification ambiguity, just risk that resources are wasted. How to avoid this could be left to network implementation.Therefore, we propose the following modified proposal:[Modified proposal 4]: UE expects that any PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command, whose activation/deactivation time is coupled to the transmission time of the associated HARQ-ACK, is scheduled via a HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled. |
| LG | Proposal 2 includes FFS on SPS PDSCH, so we would like to discuss MAC CE issue here. Thus, proposed conclusion w/o SPS PDSCH is fine for us.  |
| CAICT | Agree the MAC CE signaling in this proposal. The case of SPS PDSCH/SPS release need further study. |
| MediaTek | Support Ericsson’s modified proposal. For SPS, we also think there is no specification ambiguity. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with this conclusion. |
| CATT | We agree with this conclusion. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal and for sake of progress, discussion on SPS PDSCH can be postponed. |
| Intel | Conclusion is fine for us. |

# **#Issues-5: Performance enhancements**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-5 in section 6, in the 1st round discussion, [22] companies are provided views, more specifically,

* Up to [17] companies [Panasonic, LG, vivo, CMCC, ZTE, Thales, Huawei, Ligado, MediaTek, Sharp, Spreadtrum, Sony, CATT, China Telecom, Lenovo, CAICT, APT] are supportive for the 1st sub-bullet w.r.t the aggregated transmission.
* Up to [5] companies [Thales, Sharp, Sony, APT, CAICT] are supportive for the 2nd sub-bullet w.r.t MCS (CQI) enhancement, but [9] companies [Panasonic, LG, vivo, Intel, Apple, Huawei, CATT, Xiaomi, Lenovo] are negative.

Meanwhile, blind re-transmission is highlighted by [OPPO, Thales, Apple, Ligado]. UE assistance information is preferred by [ETRI, Samsung]. [Ericsson] points out prioritize the enhancements is not necessary. [APT] prefer to provide more simulation based evaluation for future discussion.

For this topic, based on the discussion, from moderator perspective, since this issue has been discussed for several meetings with same situation. For sake of progress, it’s better to trigger more solid discussion with evaluation/comparison to justify views. And solution with majority supports can be considered as starting point.

Then, the following updated proposal can be considered:

**[Updated Proposal 5]:**

Enhancement on the aggregated transmission for DL is prioritized for further discussion.

Companies are encourage to provide the views and if there is concerns, please provide your views on how to address the stalling of this topic:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| vivo | Agree to prioritize the enhancements on aggregated transmission. We are not sure why the updated proposal 5 is focus on DL? There is a majority possibility that UL is the coverage bottleneck needed to be enhanced. |
| Panasonic | We agree to prioritize enhancement on the aggregated transmission for both DL and UL.  |
| Huawei | We agree that enhancements discussion would be focused on aggregated transmission and related parameters design, such as aggregation factor, RV sequence, and related signalling. |
| OPPO | Not supportive. We think blind retransmission has the same priority as aggregated transmission.  |
| Ligado | Not supportive. We agree with OPPO that blind retransmission has the same priority as aggregated transmission. |
| CMCC | We support the proposal. |
| APT | Support **[Updated Proposal 5**]. In 3GPP, agreements are built from companies’ contributions, so we believe companies can still bring other proposals for blind retransmission for example. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal (also for UL). |
| LG | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal |
| Xiaomi | We also share the view that it should be applicable to both DL and UL. Meanwhile, we have a clarification question, whether the enhancement on the UL such as UL reporting to help the determination of aggregated transmission is included in the enhancement or not by the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| ETRI | Support the Updated Proposal 5 as a start point for further discussion (also for UL). |
| CATT | Support this proposal |
| ZTE | Support the proposal, for avoiding the potential overlapped, the DL related should be prioritized.  |

# **Conclusion**

In this summary, following proposals are made according to the contribution submitted in AI 8.4.3:

# **Appendix**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contribution | Observation/Proposals |
| R1-2100158 OPPO | Proposal 1: In addition to RRC configuring enabling/disabling of HARQ processes, RAN1 can investigate dynamic switching between enabling/disabling HARQ processes via DCI.Proposal 2: For Type-1 HARQ codebook, Option-1 is supported, i.e., HARQ-ACK information for disabled DL HARQ processes should be reported in Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.Proposal 3: For Type-2 HARQ codebook, Option-2 is supported, i.e., HARQ-ACK information for disabled DL HARQ processes should be reported also in Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook.Proposal 4: For enhanced Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, HARQ-ACK codebook, it should be designed with the following principles* only includes HARQ-ACK of enabled PDSCH;
* C-DAI/T-DAI value in DCI scheduling enabled PDSCH is counted for enabled PDSCH;
* C-DAI/T-DAI value in DCI scheduling disabled PDSCH is counted for disabled PDSCH;

Proposal 5: Type-3 HARQ codebook is not supported in NR-NTN. Proposal 6: The value of X is determined from N1 processing time and TBs of the two PDSCHs needs to be different. Proposal 7: PUSCH transmission constraint for a given disabled UL HARQ process should be considered. Proposal 8: Enhancements to PDSCH/PUSCH with disabled HARQ process to achieve a higher reliability should be considered. Proposal 9: Option 1 or Option 1a should be supported for enhanced HARQ process ID indication. Proposal 10: PDSCH reception constraint for a given enabled DL HARQ process should be clarified in NTN. Proposal 11: PUSCH transmission constraint for a given enabled UL HARQ process should be clarified in NTN.  |
| R1-2100224Huawei, HiSilicon | Observation 1: Slot index as MSB of HARQ process ID is more flexible for UE with supportable HARQ process number not lager than 16.Observation 2: Explicit Indication of HARQ process ID via reusing idle bits depends on DCI format design.Proposal 1: Extending HARQ process ID field shall be precluded.Proposal 2: Implicit indication of HARQ process ID via binding MSB of HARQ process ID with slot index is first preferred.Proposal 3: The HARQ-ACK feedback for a disabled HARQ process in case of Type1 and Type3 HARQ-ACK codebook is not useful.Proposal 4: Optimization on HARQ process scheduling by skipping HARQ disabled transmission occasions can be considered for reducing Type-1 and Type-3 codebook size.Proposal 5: For Type-2 codebook, DAI is not count for scheduled PDSCH from disabled HARQ process.Proposal 6: Aggregation transmission parameters can be configurable and indicated via DCI.Proposal 7: Reinterpreting idle bits in DCI for indicating transmission parameters shall be considered.Proposal 8: UE assistance information reporting in reserved resource can be considered for NTN. |
| R1-2100246 ZTE | Proposal 1: Re-interpretation of bits in DCI should be considered as the baseline to support the HARQ process indication with extended maximum HARQ process number.Proposal 2: For Type-2 codebook, enhancement to enable the DAI counting only for HARQ process with enabled feedback is supported via introducing of additional parameters. Proposal 3: For Type-3 codebook, enhancement can be enabled by only allowing the ACK-NACK generation for HARQ process with enabled feedback.Proposal 4: The link budget listed in 38.821 can be used to evaluate the UL performance for mobile UE with consideration on the potential enhancements introduced in coverage enhancement WI.Proposal 5: Enlarged aggregation factor and reduced DM-RS density should be supported to improve the performance for NTN.Proposal 6: Following enhancements are not needed to be supported.* + Blind transmission:
	+ CQI with new BLER target
	+ UCI including DL decoding Infor/MCS request
	+ Different parameters configuration
		1. MCS table
		2. Time domain resource allocation table
		3. Frequency resource allocation type 0 and type 1
		4. Block error rate target
		5. Physical resource block (PRB) bundling configuration
		6. PDSCH mapping type A and type B

Proposal 7: X = Tpro,1 is considered as minimum gap for the between PDSCHs scheduled with same HARQ ID in case of disabled HARQ feedback. |
| R1-2100306CAICT | Proposal 1: Support option 3 for all DCI formats.Proposal 2: Configure two subsets of HARQ processes for enabled HARQ processes and disabled HARQ processes respectively via RRC signaling. To decide the HARQ disable/enable state with HARQ process ID indication in the scheduling DCI.Proposal 3: HARQ-ACK for disabled HARQ is not included in the dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook.Proposal 4: Consider enhancements on DCI formats and corresponding PDCCH detection when DL HARQ process with feedback disabled and enabled are simultaneously supported for one UE.Proposal 5: Enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for DL SPS/UL CG is configured per configuration.Proposal 6: Provide higher priority order for the HARQ disabled transmission than the priority order for HARQ enabled transmission. |
| R1-2100383CATT | Observation 1: HARQ ID indication using slot index as the LSB seems reasonable.Observation 2: Additional HARQ bit can be taken from second block DCI field if only one layer tansmission supported in NTN. 1. Consider to use slot index or DCI field of second block as additional HARQ bit indication to support 32 HARQ processes in DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1.
2. Maximum 16 HARQ processes for DCI 0-0 and maximum 8 HARQ processes for DCI 1-0 can be supported.
3. No enhancement is needed for type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook.
4. Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook can be optimized, and the counter DAI and total DAI for a PDSCH with a feedback disabled HARQ process are the same as the previous PDSCH with a feedback enabled HARQ process.
5. For SPS case, the HARQ-ACK feedback for activation and release command can be enabled.
6. Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is not needed in NTN case.
7. UE expects that at least one HARQ process with feedback is configured for the scheduling of MAC-CE.
8. Slot aggregation factor can be extended to 16 for very low SINR case.
9. Support time interleaved slot aggregation to improve transmission reliability.
10. There is no need for the enhancement on MCS.
11. The minimum time gap between two neighboring disabled PDSCHs with same HARQ ID should not include HARQ-ACK preparation time.
12. From UE perspective, the TBs of two neighboring PDSCHs with same HARQ ID in HARQ disabling case should be different.
 |
| R1-2100443vivo | Observation 1: The gNB can transmit the DCI of scheduling a PUSCH for a given HARQ process before it receives the previous PUSCH transmission for the same HARQ process.* The time gap of the two DCI scheduling the same HARQ process should be not smaller than the slot offset K2 .
* The absolute time of the DCI arriving at UE should after the end of the expected transmission of the last PUSCH for the same HARQ process.
* The downlink frame/slot number of the DCI arriving at UE may be less than uplink frame/slot number of the transmission of the previous PUSCH for the same HARQ process.

Proposal 1：Enhanced HARQ process ID indication is supported by the following:* For DCI 0-1/1-1 and DCI 0-2/1-2, extending the HARQ process ID field to 5 bits.
* For DCI 0-0/1-0, re-interpreting existing DCI field to indicate the extension of HARQ ID.

Proposal 2：HARQ codebook enhancements are supported as:* For Type-1 HARQ codebook:
	+ If both enabled HARQ processes or SPS release and disabled HARQ processes are transmitted in the  occasions, no enhancement.
	+ If only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted in the occasions, omit the HARQ-ACK report.
* For Type-2 HARQ codebook:
	+ HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with enabled HARQ processes and SPS release.
	+ The value of T-DAI in a DCI format denotes the total number of {serving cell, PDCCH monitoring occasion}-pair(s) in which PDSCH reception(s) with enabled HARQ and SPS PDSCH release associated with the DCI formats up to the current PDCCH monitoring occasion.
	+ The value of C-DAI in a DCI format denotes the accumulative number of {serving cell, PDCCH monitoring occasion}-pair(s) in which PDSCH reception(s) with enabled HARQ or SPS PDSCH release associated with the DCI formats up to the current serving cell and current PDCCH monitoring occasion.
* For Type-3 HARQ codebook:
	+ HARQ-ACK codebook includes HARQ-ACK of all the enabled HARQ processes in one shot.

Proposal 3：For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process until  after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.* The TB of the two PDSCHs can be same or different.
 |
| R1-2100485 Ligado | The following are the main conclusions.* For heavy blockage, as represented by the Heavy Tree-Shadowed environment, ABR yields a substantial improvement over the legacy, No-Repeat system.
* The improvement is greater for higher coding rate (higher open-sky throughput) systems than lower coding rate systems.
* For moderate to light blockage, ABR and No-Repeat systems have approximately similar throughputs, although ABR does perform 10 – 20% better.
* The lower BLERs of ABR relative to No Repeat show the effectiveness of packet repetition.
 |
| R1-2100491BUPT | Observation 1: Under different channel scenarios, the system with HRAQ process ID indication enhancement has obviously higher throughput than that has 4 bits of HARQ process ID field.Observation 2: ACBG-HARQ can significantly reduce the memory overflow probability of the receiver and improve the transmission spectrum efficiency of the system.Observation 3: In different channel scenarios, the transmission performance degradation caused by memory overflow is different, and the gain brought by the HARQ mechanism with adaptive code block group size is different.Proposal 1: Within the capacity of the communication system, more HARQ processes should be supported to achieve higher system throughput gain.Proposal 2: In NTN scenarios, the HARQ mechanism should add the indicator symbol of memory state in UCI, and adjust the CBG size of transmission according to memory state information, so as to reduce the memory consumption and improve the spectrum efficiency of the system.Proposal 3: In different channel scenarios, the decline of system transmission performance is different due to receiver memory overflow. The smaller the CBG transmission size will lead to the increase of the number of HARQ feedback information, so the selection of CBG size should be optimized according to the system requirements. |
| R1-2100596 MTK | Proposal 1: Support of 32 HARQ processes in the device is a UE capability in NR NTN.Proposal 2: Support one of the following options for enhanced HARQ process ID indication:* Option 2: Reuse one bit from DCI RV field, where only RV0 is used, or RV0 and RV3 are used.
* Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits

Observation 1: Reporting a NACK on HARQ process with disabled UL HARQ feedback should not be seen as an enhancement, as it the simplest way to apply the existing specifications.Proposal 3: For Type-1 HARQ codebook, support Option-2: Report NACK on disabled processProposal 4: For Type-2 HARQ codebook, support Option-2: No enhancements.Observation 2: It is up to gNB implementation if UL HARQ feedback is not disabled for Message 3 during initial access.Proposal 5: A LS to RAN2 with capturing following options is needed to resolve the issue related to MAC CE activation/deactivation command:* Option 1: UE expects that at least one HARQ process for DL scheduling is configured for the scheduling of MAC-CE.
* Option 2: Up to gNB’s implementation for scheduling

Observation 3: In NR specifications, the MCS selection, time domain allocation, and frequency resource allocation type 0 and type 1 can be done first as in the specifications. Then, repetitions with values 2, 4, or 8 to increase the reliability of each transmissions as in URLLC can be done based on pdsch-AggregationFactor for DL or repK for UL based on RRC configuration. Increasing value for pdsch-AggregationFactor for DL or repK for UL to 16 or 32 has minimum impact on the specification.Proposal 6: Support higher level of slot aggregation / repetitions 16 or 32* FFS DMRS time bundling with level of slot aggregation / repetitions > 8

Proposal 7: For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until N1 symbols after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process, where N1 is as defined in TS 38.214, Tables 5.3-1 and 5.3-2. |
| R1-2100656 Intel | Proposal 1: * Support Rel. 15 Type I HARQ codebook for the case where HARQ feedback is disabled for a subset of HARQ processes
* For Type II HARQ codebook, PDSCH with disabled HARQ feedback is not counted for DAI and the corresponding ACK/NACK is not transmitted by the UE

Proposal 2: * HARQ process ID is determined based on DCI indication and slot index of the corresponding transmission as MSB or LSB
	+ 4 bits are used for HARQ process ID indication in DCI
 |
| R1-2100705LG | Proposal 1: For enhanced HARQ process id identification in NTN, support option 3 (Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits) with non-fallback DCI (DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1) only.Proposal 2: FFS on the use case and clear benefit of dynamic HARQ enabling/disabling. Proposal 3. For transmission enhancement when HARQ feedback is disabled, consider recommended repetition factor, PDSCH decoding results or probability as new CSI contents. Proposal 4. Discuss PDSCH scheduling restriction if two PDSCHs are associated with different HARQ process id and one of two PDSCHs is HARQ feedback disabled. Proposal 5. For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement, option 3 (reduced codebook size with criteria) is preferred. Proposal 6. For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement, HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, and the C-DAI and T-DAI are given their true values (i.e., the count of feedback-enabled processes) in the DCI of PDSCH with enabled/disabled HARQ processes.Proposal 7. UE feedbacks acknowledgement for the reception of SPS activation DCI, if the first PDSCH after reception of the SPS activation DCI is with disabled HARQ process. Proposal 8. Support enhancements on Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook by including enabled HARQ processes only.  |
| R1-2100759Lenovo | Proposal 1: The HARQ process number is tied to SFN/slot index of PDCCH/PUSCH/PDSCH for DCI format 0-0/1-0 and DCI format 0-1/1-1 if UE is configured with HARQ process number of 32.Proposal 2: For DCI 0-2/1-2, the HARQ process number field in DCI is determined to higher layer parameter.Proposal 3: Different numbers of HARQ processes is configured based on UE capability.Proposal 4: UE assumes the HARQ feedback disabling where HARQ ID belongs to the RRC configured HARQ process disabling subset.Proposal 5: The multiple transmissions of same TBs in consecutive or interlaced slots can be considered when HARQ is disabledProposal 6: Repetition transmission number and interlace transmission interval can be indicated in corresponding DCI when HARQ process disabling.Proposal 7: A unified configuration should be considered for each HARQ process with/without feedback except aggregation factor if benefit identified.Proposal 8: For Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook, no enhancement is needed for NR NTN.Proposal 9: For Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook, HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with HARQ feedback enabled, and counter DAI and total DAI are not increased for a PDCCH with HARQ feedback disabled.Proposal 10: Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is not supported for NR NTN. |
| R1-2100809Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: Option 2 and Option 3 should be considered for HARQ process ID indication.Proposal 2: Blind retransmission and larger aggregation/repetition factor can be considered for enhancing the performance of transmission.Proposal 3: Option-1 for Type-2 HARQ codebook enhancement and Option-2 for Type-1 HARQ codebook enhancement should be considered. |
| R1-2100861Sony | Observation 1: When HARQ feedback is disabled for some HARQ processes, the redundant feedback bits of Type-1 / semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook would be large based on current HARQ-ACK codebook designProposal 1: Unified solution of HARQ process indication for all DCI formats, down select from following options:* Option 1: Slot index as the MSB
* Option 1-a: Slot index as the LSB
* Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
* Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits

Proposal 2: Send LS to RAN2 with capturing following options to resolve the issue related to MAC CE activation/deactivation command:* + Option 1: UE expects that at least one HARQ process with feedback enabled is configured for the DL scheduling of MAC CE.
		- FFS all MAC CE need mandatory HARQ process with feedback enabled.
	+ Option 2: Up to gNB’s implementation for scheduling.
		- FFS the timing relationship of MAC CE activation/deactivation via HARQ process with HARQ feedback disabled.

Proposal 3: HARQ codebook enhancement is supported as:* For Type-1 HARQ codebook, reduce codebook size with keeping the codebook size semi-static.
* For Type-2 HARQ codebook, reduce codebook size with HARQ codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of dynamic scheduling PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ process.
	+ C-DAI, T-DAI and DAI in DCI format 0\_1 count only DCI scheduling PDSCH with HARQ-ACK enabling.
		- In both DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes and feedback-disabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given the count value of feedback-enabled process.
* Don’t support Type-3 HARQ codebook in NTN.

Proposal 4: When the HARQ process of SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled, UE reports HARQ feedback information for the SPS PDSCH activation. Proposal 5: The counter DAI, total DAI and DAI in DCI format 0\_1 count for PDCCH indicating SPS PDSCH activation for HARQ process with feedback disabled. |
| R1-2100913China Telecom | Proposal 1: Enhanced HRAQ process ID indication is supported by either,Opt 1: Reusing one bit from other bit field as a unified solution for all DCI formats, orOpt 2: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for other DCI formats while DCI 0\_0/1\_0 remains the same.Proposal 2: Type-1 HARQ codebook can be enhanced by reducing the codebook size.Proposal 3: The existing scheduling rule should be kept for PUSCH. |
| R1-2100928Ericsson | Observation 1 It is not necessary to schedule 32 HARQ processes using fallback DCI 0\_0/1\_0.Observation 2 Adding an additional configurable bit in DCI 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2 to support 32 HARQ processes minimizes the impacts on specification and scheduling.Observation 3 Time window-based method (and its variations) for supporting 32 HARQ processes is not aligned with asynchronous NR HARQ design principle, introduces unnecessary scheduling restriction, and thus is against the RAN1 agreement of “minimizing the impacts on specification and scheduling.”Observation 4 Reusing one bit from other bit field to indicate 32 HARQ processes is not a clean design approach. Such hack in the specification should in general be avoided, as it can easily cause confusion and complications in the specification.Observation 5 If the reused bit is from a field that is not applicable when HARQ feedback is disabled, it will couple two features, i.e., 32 HARQ processes can only be used when HARQ feedback is disabled, which is highly undesirable.Observation 6 The intention of disabling HARQ feedback for a downlink transmission is not to send HARQ feedback for the downlink transmission.Observation 7 If the network schedules a PDSCH on a HARQ process with feedback disabled, it is clear that the network is not interested in receiving the feedback.Observation 8 Sending feedback from UE for a HARQ process with disabled feedback leads to waste of radio resource and UE power consumption, as well as increased interference.Observation 9 RAN1 already agreed that Type-3 HARQ codebook can be applied beyond unlicensed spectrum.Observation 10 NR is a toolbox of features. Each feature should not be limited to a certain use case or deployment and it is up to implementation to use it as fit.Observation 11 There should not be some artificial restriction that Type-3 HARQ codebook is not applicable to NTN.Observation 12 The uplink HARQ process reuse rule that “the UE is not expected to be scheduled to transmit another PUSCH for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of the last PUSCH for that HARQ process” does not impose restriction that would lead to throughput reduction in the presence of large RTT, regardless of whether the DL and UL frame timings are aligned or not at the gNB/UE.Observation 13 The downlink HARQ process reuse rule that “the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of HARQ-ACK for that HARQ process” is not applicable to a HARQ process with feedback disabled.Proposal 1 Whether 32 HARQ processes are used or not in the uplink can be configured by RRC.Proposal 2 Whether 32 HARQ processes are used or not in the downlink can be configured by RRC.Proposal 3 If 32 HARQ processes are configured, an additional bit is present in DCI 0\_1/1\_1. This additional bit, together with the existing 4 bits in the HARQ process ID field, can be used to indicate 32 HARQ processes.Proposal 4 If 32 HARQ processes are configured, the size of the HARQ process ID field in DCI 0\_2/2\_2 is 5 bits.Proposal 5 UE does not expect a MAC CE activation/deactivation command, which would become effective 3 msec after the UE would transmit the corresponding HARQ-ACK, to be scheduled on a downlink HARQ process with disabled feedback.Proposal 6 RAN1 to discuss what parameters need to be configured differently for HARQ processes with feedback and HARQ processes without feedback. One example parameter is aggregation factor.Proposal 7 When HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, in the case of the NR Type-1 HARQ codebook, the UE inserts NACKs in positions corresponding to PDSCHs associated with feedback disabled HARQ processes.Proposal 8 When HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, in the case of the NR Type-2 HARQ codebook, the codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of enabled PDSCH, and: C-DAI/T-DAI value in DCI is counted only for feedback enabled HARQ processes C-DAI/T-DAI field in DCI scheduling feedback disabled HARQ process is reserved.Proposal 9 When HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, in the case of the NR Type-3 HARQ codebook, the codebook size is dimensioned to include ACK/NACK information only for HARQ processes that are enabled.Proposal 10 Keep the existing uplink HARQ process reuse rule.Proposal 11 X is defined FROM the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback TO the start of the DCI scheduling another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH for the given HARQ process.Proposal 12 The value of X should be less than $Tproc,1$ when the PDSCH is scheduled on a HARQ process with feedback disabled.Proposal 13 The scheduling restriction applies regardless of whether the TB of the two PDSCHs is the same or different, i.e., it is up to gNB scheduling. |
| R1-2100973APT,FGI | Observation 1 In principle, the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook has a fixed codebook size and the Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook has a dynamic codebook size.Proposal 1 Reuse $Tproc,1$ in Rel-16 NR for the value of X and units for the PDSCH scheduling restriction when HARQ-ACK is disabled.Proposal 2 Support a single value of X for PDSCH scheduling restriction that can be applied for the same or different PDSCHs.Proposal 3 RAN1 shall confirm the support on the maximal HARQ process number is up to UE capability.Proposal 4 To support HARQ > 32, the use of fallback DCI formats, i.e., DCI 0-0/1-0, shall be justified with a reasonable need.Proposal 5 At least for DCI format 1\_2, Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits shall be supported.Proposal 6 For Type-2 HARQ codebook, support Option-1: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processesProposal 7 For the Type-2 HARQ codebook to support Option-1, a possible enhancement shall reuse the existing pseudo-code given in TS 38.213 by adding a new procedure at the end of the pseudo-code to further reduce its codebook size.Proposal 8 RAN1 shall discuss a possible consequence if a UE receives a MAC CE activation/deactivation command without HARQ-ACK protection. |
| R1-2100986InterDigital | Observation-1: lowering target BLER for PDSCH when HARQ feedback is disabled is beneficial in terms of resource utilization and latency as it can reduce the number of retransmissions in higher layerObservation-2: use of a CQI table with a lower BLER target (e.g., 1%) could provide a better link adaptation with lower PDSCH BLER target when HARQ feedback is disabledProposal-1: a CQI table with a new target BLER (e.g., 1%) is considered when HARQ feedback is disabledProposal-2: blind retransmission is considered when HARQ feedback is disabledProposal-3: support extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits (i.e., Option 3)Proposal-4: support Option-3 for Type-1 HARQ CB and Option-1 for Type-2 HARQ CB |
| R1-2101025Panasonic | Proposal 1: 1 bit is added for HARQ process ID indication in DCI format 0\_1, 1\_1 and 0\_2, 1\_2.Proposal 2: Enhancement of PDSCH/PUSCH transmission to improve user throughput without further increasing the number of HARQ processes should be discussed.Proposal 3: Transport block size scaling in case of repetition should be considered to improve user throughput with a limited number of HARQ processes. Alternatively, it should be considered to apply the same solution as multi-slot PUSCH in coverage enhancement WI for both PUSCH and PDSCH in NTN. Proposal 4: For both type 1 and type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook for HARQ-feedback disabled process, no change of UE behaviour from Rel.15/16, i.e. generate HARQ-ACK even for HARQ-feedback disabled process and include it in the HARQ-ACK codebook. |
| R1-2101044CMCC | Observation 1: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, error cases may occur for Option 3 (Reduce codebook size with criteria) if the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined based on dynamic scheduling.* If any DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ process was miss-detected, miss understanding may occur on the bit size of the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook between the gNB and the UE.
* The position of ACK/NACK for PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ process in the reported Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook are not fixed, and it depends on which one of the DCIs of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ process was miss-detected.

Observation 2: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, scheduling flexibility may be significantly reduced for Option 3 (Reduce codebook size with criteria) if the HARQ-ACK codebook is determined based on semi-static scheduling.Observation 3: For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, even if the UE identified DCI miss detection event for PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes, the UE can NOT trigger RLC retransmission due to unknow the SN of the corresponding RLC PDU.Proposal 1: At least support extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1.Proposal 2: At least support extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-0/1-0.Proposal 3: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, down select Option 1 (No enhancement).Proposal 4: For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, Option-1 (Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes) can be supported.Proposal 5: For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement with reduced codebook size, disable the C-DAI field and T-DAI field in DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes can be considered.Proposal 6: Enhancement on aggregated transmission (including repetition) can be prioritized. |
| R1-2101080ETRI | Observation 1 : The worst scenarios for transmission correspond to the cases having both GEO and handheld.* For SC5, the DL geometry SINR range might be from 1.5 dB (5%) to 5 dB (95%).
* For other cases (SC{4,19,20}), the DL geometry SINR range might be from -6 dB (5%) to 1 dB (95%).

Observation 2 : The slot aggregation (aggregation factor>1) could enhance BLER and SE simultaneously within low S(I)NR ranges.Observation 3 : The slot aggregation (aggregation factor> 1) might be inevitable for achieving target BLER.Observation 4 : The change of aggregation factor might be needed for achieving optimal SE performance.Observation 5 : If more challenging target BLER than 10-2 is required, 8 aggregated transmission (aggregation factor=8) might be insufficient for NTN.Observation 6 : For optimal adaptation, different aggregation factor might be applied depending on the parameter (especially IMCS).Observation 7 : For optimal adaptation, different aggregation factor should be applied depending on the target performance.Observation 8 : In NR, various kinds of transport channels are multiplexed into PDSCH/PUSCH.* Target performance of each transport channel might be distinguishable by checking the RNTI

Observation 9 : In NTN, different target performance might be defined by the HARQ feedback availability.Observation 10 : The value of aggregation factor should be determined properly if slot aggregation is used. * Too reliable parameter : throughput loss
* Proper parameter : optimal adaptation
* Too un-reliable parameter : reliability/latency loss (might be unable to communicate)

Observation 11 : NR gNB cannot distinguish between just proper parameter and too reliable parameter, if the slot aggregation is used. * 0 CRC OK in a bundle (too un-reliable parameter) : NACK
* only 1 CRC OK in a bundle (proper parameter) : ACK
* multiple(>1) CRC OK in a bundle (too reliable parameter) : ACK

Observation 12 : NR gNB cannot optimally react to some cases, if the slot aggregation is used.* toward better reliability : possible (reaction for receiving NACK quite consistently)
* maintain : possible (reaction for receiving ACKs quite consistently)
* toward better throughput : (seems to be )impossible

Observation 13 : In NR, there is no feedback mechanism to guide aggregation factor into lower value for better throughput* Once the aggregation factor value gets larger, it may be impossible to be reduced again

Observation 14 : If all the HARQ feedback are disabled, gNB cannot optimally react to all cases* toward better reliability : (seems to be )impossible
* maintain : (seems to be )impossible
* toward better throughput : (seems to be )impossible

Observation 15 : UL feedback might be helpful to guide aggregation factor into optimal value* non-optimal value might lead the throughput loss from 15% to 72%.

Observation 16 : UL feedback via MAC-CE/RRC might be preferred rather than UL feedback via UCI.* specification impact would be minimized
* soft combinable retransmission mechanism on PUSCH might be beneficial for compensating in low S(I)NR under NTN

Proposal 1 : Consider the enhancement via “larger aggregation factor” as the one of the NTN’s transmission enhancement solutions for achieving target BLER performance.Proposal 2 : Consider the enhancement via “different aggregation factors” as the one of the NTN’s transmission enhancement solutions.* the followings might be a start point for configuring different aggregation factors
	+ (a group of) MCS index
	+ (a group of) RNTI type (or search space)
	+ HARQ feedback availability (enabled/disabled)
	+ combinations of the above
	+ subsets of the above

Proposal 3 : Consider the enhancement via “UL feedback” as the one of the NTN’s transmission enhancement solutions for achieving better adaptation performance.* UL feedback can include information such as
	+ request for guiding pdsch-AggregationFactor
	+ decoding statistics
	+ combination of the above
* MAC-CE/RRC might be also acceptable, instead of UCI.
	+ for minimizing specification impact.
	+ for compensating low S(I)NR in NTN by using soft combinable retransmissions on PUSCH

Proposal 4 : For “Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field” to support enhanced HARQ process ID indication for DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1, either MSB or LSB in the 2-bit redundancy version field can be considered. |
| R1-2101119Xiaomi | Proposal 1: The number of supported HARQ processes is subject to the UE’s capability.Proposal 2: Slot index as MSB or LSB can be taken as additional indication to support more than 16 HARQ processes.Proposal 3: The enhancement on the type 1 codebook design is not desired.Proposal 4: C-DAI and T-DAI count both PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes and PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes.Proposal 5: Dynamic HARQ enabling/disabling is not supported.Proposal 6: Enhancement on the UCI reporting such as the data decoding statistics should be introduced. |
| R1-2101208Samsung | Proposal 1: Enhanced Type-2 and Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebooks are not supported for NTN. Proposal 2: Enable a gNB to avoid HARQ-ACK information in a Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for HARQ processes with disabled HARQ-ACK information by configuring a bitmap that indicates slots where the UE should generate HARQ-ACK information. Proposal 3: When HARQ-ACK information for a HARQ process with disabled HARQ-ACK information is included in a HARQ-ACK codebook, the UE reports* A predetermined HARQ-ACK information value, such as a NACK, for the HARQ process with disabled HARQ-ACK information when the UCI payload size is no more than 11 bits.
* HARQ-ACK information based on a reception outcome of a corresponding TB for the HARQ process with disabled HARQ-ACK information when the UCI payload size is more than 11 bits.

Proposal 4: A Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK information for HARQ processes with enabled HARQ-ACK information report. * DAI values change only when a TB in a corresponding PDSCH is associated with HARQ process with enabled HARQ-ACK information report.

 Proposal 5: Support a larger number of repetitions for NTN * The number of repetitions is indicated by the DCI format as in Rel-16.
* Extend the “Time domain resource assignment” field or add a new field to indicate the increased number of repetitions.

Proposal 6: For the HARQ process ID indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits when the number of HARQ processes is 32.Proposal 7: For the maximum number of HARQ processes, support the following options. * Option 1. gNB broadcasts the maximum TBS to be configured for the cell and UE reports its capability for a number of HARQ processes.
* Option 2. UE reports its capability for a number of pairs of {maximum number of HARQ processes, maximum TBS constraint}.

Proposal 8: UE assistance information for HARQ should be supported for NTN. |
| R1-2101289Thales | Observation 1: 1% BLER target reduces RLC throughput by 7%.Observation 2: The transport block error rates in low-speed geostationary simulations are significantly below the BLER targetsObservation 3: There is no significant difference in transport block error rates for 1% and 10% BLER targetsObservation 4: CQI table inaccuracy further decreases the selected MCS and error rates in many casesObservation 5: Enabling blind PDSCH retransmissions for all UEs wastes resources and drops throughput significantlyObservation 6: A single blind PDSCH retransmission was able to reduce the error rate from 0.5% to 0%.Observation 7: NLOS UEs do not get any TP while LOS UEs always get some TP.Observation 8: The presence of NLOS UEs leaves more resources for LOS UEs therefore increasing their TP.Observation 9: The TP distribution of LOS UEs is not impacted by the presence of NLOS UEs.Observation 10: The dynamic channel condition simulations are more difficult to analyse.Proposal 1: No need for new BLER target in low-speed NTN GEO scenario.Proposal 2: Allow to send blind PDSCH (re)transmission of the same packet by MAC scheduling without waiting for the transmission of the HARQ feedback.Proposal 3: Blind retransmissions should be possible to configure per UE.Proposal 4: For GEO scenarios change the channel model to a LOS only channel model meaning instead of Table 6.6.1-1 of TR 38.811[5] use 100% LOS probability. |
| R1-2101298Nokia | Proposal 1: Define [X] to have a value of 1 slot.Proposal 2: For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until 1 slot after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.Proposal 3: The transport blocks for PDSCH transmissions under the same HARQ Process with HARQ-ACK feedback may be the same, thereby still allowing for HARQ gains, even when HARQ feedback is be disabled.Proposal 4: For Type-1 HARQ codebook the codebook size should not be depending on the configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback (feedback enabled or disabled).Proposal 5: For Type-2 HARQ codebook the codebook size should not be depending on the configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback (feedback enabled or disabled).Proposal 6: For Type-3 HARQ codebook the codebook size should not be depending on the configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback (feedback enabled or disabled).Proposal 7: Do a down-selection of the options for indication of HARQ process ID such that only one option is specified. Proposal 8: Enhanced HARQ process ID indication is supported for DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1 by extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits when configuredProposal 9: Assign one additional bit for indicating the MSB of the HARQ process ID for DCI format 0-0 and DCI format 1-0Proposal 10: UEs supporting NTN should by default support the maximum number of HARQ processes to ensure network efficiency. |
| R1-2101385Apple | Proposal 1: Enhanced HARQ process number indication is supported for DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1 by down-selecting between extending the HARQ process number field up to 5 bits and reusing one bit from another bit field.Proposal 2: Enhanced HARQ process number indication is supported for DCI 0\_0 and DCI 1\_0 by reusing one bit from another DCI bit field (e.g., RV field). Proposal 3: Support to have different configurations for HARQ processes with or without HARQ feedback. Proposal 4: Support blind PDSCH and PUSCH retransmissions for NTN. Proposal 5: In type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction, UE does not reduce the HARQ-ACK codebook size for HARQ processes with disabled HARQ feedback.Proposal 6: In type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction, reduce the codebook size for HARQ processes with disabled feedback.* In DCI of PDSCH with feedback enabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given their true values.
* In DCI of PDSCH with feedback disabled HARQ processes, the T-DAI is given its true value and C-DAI is given a reserved value.

Proposal 7: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook only for SPS PDSCH and for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCH, consider whether/how to support the case where SPS configuration includes HARQ processes with different HARQ feedback settings.Proposal 8: For a downlink HARQ process with disabled feedback, a UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until $T\_{proc,1}$ after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process. |
| R1-2101466Qualcomm | Observation 1: Within a lookback window of size $N$ (corresponding to a PUCCH occasion), for up to $M (M<N)$ PDSCHs of HARQ processes with feedback enabled (in any of the $N$ candidate occasions), $1+\sum\_{i=0}^{M-1}\left(\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{N}{i}\right) $codepoints are sufficient to construct a lossless semi-static ACK/NACK codebook.Proposal 1: When 32 HARQ processes is configured, UE determines the HARQ ID as 16\*mod(n,2) +k where* n is the slot number during which the DCI was first transmitted
* k is indicated by the 4 HARQ process ID bits in DCI

Proposal 2: For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until X after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.* X=max(Tproc,1, Tslot\*k) where k is the minimum of minimum of  dl-DataToUL-ACK if configured and 0 otherwise.

Proposal 3: Consider new CQI BLER targets for HARQ processes without feedbacks.Proposal 4: Support a new UCI feedback for reporting DL transmission disruption and/or requesting DL scheduling changes when HARQ feedback is disabled. * To study the new UCI format and associated resource allocation.

Proposal 5: For DL HARQ processes with HARQ feedback disabled, initial transmissions shall use RV 0 and retransmissions shall not use RV 0.Proposal 6: For Type-2 HARQ codebook* Only HARQ-ACKs of PDSCHs of HARQ processes with feedback enabled are included in the codebook
* Only PDSCHs of HARQ processes with feedback enabled are counted in DAIs in DCI.

Proposal 7: For semi-static HARQ ACK codebooks, within a lookback window of size $N$ PDSCHs candidate occasions, a UE may be scheduled with up to $M (M<N)$ PDSCHs of HARQ processes with feedback enabled, where the PDSCHs may be scheduled in any of the $N$ candidate position(s) within the lookback window.* The value of $M$ as a function of N are to be configured for the UE.

Proposal 8: RAN1 to consider semi-static HARQ codebook designs for limited PDSCH candidate occasions of HARQ processes with feedback enabled, with the aim of reducing the codebook size.Proposal 9: Support different transmit parameters and/or configurations per HARQ process or per HARQ process type (retransmissions is enabled/disabled), including* Power control
* MCS table
* UCI multiplexing parameters
* FFS other parameters

Proposal 10: For NTN, UE may receive a DCI scheduling a PUSCH of a given HARQ process before the end of the transmission of another PUSCH of that HARQ process. Proposal 11: Define a minimum time gap between two PUSCHs of a HARQ process. |